United Nations S/PV.5225

Security Council

Sixtieth year

Provisional

5225th meeting

Tuesday, 12 July 2005, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Molyviatis	(Greece)
Members:	Algeria	Mr. Osmane
	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	Benin	Mr. Zinsou
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Zhang Yishan
	Denmark	Ms. Løj
	France	Mr. De La Sablière
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Philippines	Mr. Baja
	Romania	Mr. Dumitru
	Russian Federation	Mr. Denisov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Mahiga
	United States of America	Mrs. Patterson

Agenda

The role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises: challenges, lessons learned and the way ahead

Letter dated 6 July 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2005/434)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

05-41609 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises: challenges, lessons learned and the way ahead

Letter dated 6 July 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2005/434)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Canada, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Norway, Peru, the Republic of Korea and Venezuela in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Guéhenno to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2005/434, which contains the text of a letter dated 6 July 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

It is my particular pleasure to acknowledge the presence of the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, who, as we all know, attaches great importance to the subject of today's debate.

Allow me to open the debate by making a statement in my national capacity.

Since the early 1990s, of all the challenges that can affect peace and stability in today's globalized world, humanitarian crises have been those that have captured most of our minds and souls. We cannot forget Somalia, Rwanda or the Balkans, to cite just three.

Those crises, beyond being a threat to stability and peace, are the source of a lot of despair and suffering to human beings around the globe and thus a direct and powerful challenge to our collective consciousness — a challenge to the set of values and principles the United Nations is based upon. They are also a challenge to our ability to act in a coherent and effective manner, first to prevent, secondly to settle, and thirdly to heal the wounds in the post-conflict phase.

Today's discussion takes place in the midst of the reform of the United Nations, in which efforts are being made towards more effective international action. I hope that it will be a substantial contribution in that direction.

The Security Council has witnessed the expansion of issues brought before it as threats to international peace and security. In some of those cases, the Security Council has taken action to avert a major humanitarian crisis; in some others, it has not.

The early prevention of humanitarian crises has become a political and moral imperative for the Security Council. The United Nations should strengthen its capacity to move from reaction to prevention of crises before they reach critical mass.

The duty and responsibility for the protection of civilian populations rests, of course, primarily with the States concerned. However, in cases of extreme violations and atrocities against human beings, the international community has an obligation to the victims of such violence. The United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, must take effective action to alleviate the suffering of civilians and to avert the occurrence of a humanitarian disaster.

In recent years, the Council has tried hard to meet that challenge, guided by the new comprehensive concept of human security. That concept engulfs issues such as human rights, the protection of civilians — particularly women and children — in armed conflicts, internally displaced persons and refugees, and combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

The Secretary-General, in his report "In larger freedom", has pointed out that

> "A war-weary population infused with new hope after the signing of a peace agreement quickly reverts to despair when, instead of seeing tangible progress towards a Government under the rule of law, it sees war lords and gang leaders take power and become laws unto themselves." (*A/59/2005, para. 130*)

We fully share that view, and we note with satisfaction that recent United Nations peace operations integrate, among other things, elements of good governance, the rule of law, election monitoring, and respect for human rights.

To prevent the re-emergence of humanitarian suffering itself and the potential recurrence of the conflict, in our view the following three key fields of post-conflict security have to be adequately addressed: the promotion of the rule of law; the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants; and security sector reform.

The planning and incorporation of rule of law components in peace operations are an extremely sensitive and complex task. They require the involvement of various actors, both international and national. Of great importance in that respect is legislative and justice system reform incorporating international human rights and criminal law standards, the enforcement of domestic law, the monitoring of elections, and so on. The transition to a just, human and democratic order cannot be achieved unless impunity comes to an end. The role of the International Criminal Court in advancing the principles of international justice and national reconciliation is of vital importance, as recently reaffirmed by the decision of the Security Council to recognize its jurisdiction in the Darfur crisis.

The importance of the disarmament and demobilization process in peacebuilding has been rightly emphasized in previous discussions before the Security Council. The reintegration of ex-combatants into civilian life should be given special attention, since, without it, lasting peace cannot be achieved.

Security sector reform is the third important area in achieving long-term stability, complementing the previous two areas of action. Security sector reform, despite its importance, seems to have gained little attention in Security Council resolutions. It is important, I think, that our future actions focus on that key area, as well as on its operational complementarity to the other two areas.

Last but not least, let us remember that, to ensure the success of any measure adopted, the maximum consent of local societies to the international community's efforts is of paramount importance, even if not always easy to acquire.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that effective post-conflict peacebuilding requires the full incorporation and support of humanitarian components in peace agreements and peace operations. Those three areas are critical to ensuring and enhancing both conflict prevention and conflict resolution, as well as for the implementation of any peace agreement and its sustainability.

We believe that the prevention of future humanitarian crises requires the timely consideration of the aforementioned issues and the concerted action of the Security Council, other United Nations agencies, and regional bodies, as well as the cooperation of the Member States.

The effective and timely response of the Security Council to the challenges posed by humanitarian crises is of critical importance. I think that our peoples and international public opinion will settle for nothing less than success.

I once again welcome the presence of Secretary-General Kofi Annan at this meeting and invite him to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: It is very good to see you here in New York, Mr. Minister, as we discuss this important topic. Let me thank you for convening this thematic debate. The topic you have chosen is particularly timely, since in these days we are marking the tenth anniversary of a dark moment in the history of the United Nations.

On 11 July 1995, Srebrenica, a place that the Security Council had proclaimed a safe area and that was manned by United Nations peacekeeping forces, fell to the attacking Serb forces. On 13 July, the systematic killing of Muslim men and boys began. As we reflect on those shameful events, we are reminded that, whenever the Security Council takes responsibility for protecting civilians, it must craft an unambiguous mandate and provide adequate resources to do the job properly, and that everyone involved — from the Council itself, the broader membership of the Organization and the Secretariat here in New York to our personnel on the ground — must fully understand the expectations they have aroused among people desperate for protection in the face of grave danger.

But the truth is that this theme could be taken as encompassing almost the whole of the Council's current agenda, since almost every crisis that the Council has to deal with includes a humanitarian dimension. Indeed, it is often the sheer scale of human suffering, more than anything else, that impels the international community to intervene. Our task should be to prevent such suffering. All too often we fail to do so because we do not recognize the gravity of the threat until too late. That is why I believe that Member States should recognize that whenever a particular State is unable or unwilling to protect its citizens against extreme violence, there is a collective responsibility for all States to do so, a responsibility that must be assumed by the Council.

Debate tends to focus on the extreme cases where only forceful intervention can halt the bloodshed. Yet the earlier we tackle a crisis by other means, the better our chances of preventing it from reaching that point. I therefore join the President in stressing the importance of helping to prevent future conflicts by addressing their root causes.

The Council has already adopted important resolutions on this subject, and I have devoted several reports to it. In a few days' time, a major civil-society conference on prevention will be held here at United Nations Headquarters. In the light of that conference's deliberations, I hope the Council will return to it in the near future, focusing especially on practical modalities.

Meanwhile, the Council has a heavy caseload of countries already affected by conflict or tentatively emerging from it. The most frustrating cases are countries that relapse into conflict only a few years after the international community has helped them emerge from it. We have learned from bitter experience that peacebuilding, in order to be successful, needs to be sustained over a period of years and to include a broad range of tasks. Those include reintegrating and rehabilitating demobilized combatants, helping societies and markets to recover their vitality and, most crucially of all, strengthening the capacity of State and social institutions to provide security and justice based on the rule of law.

In a moment, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Guéhenno, will speak in more detail about the problems of providing genuine security in post-conflict situations. For my part, I wish briefly to stress the importance of the rule of law. That is something that cannot be imposed from outside. Local actors must genuinely understand that only confidence in the rule of law will ensure lasting security, by enabling people of different factions or communities to rely on the forces of the State, rather than on factional militias, for protection. For that to happen, courts and other institutions must be based not on an imported model, but on the culture and traditions of the local society.

The role of the international community is to galvanize and provide technical assistance to that process while making sure that all national actors are included in it. It must do so in a coordinated manner. Different parts of the United Nations system, including the international financial institutions, need to cooperate closely with each other and with bilateral donors and troop contributors. Ensuring that coordination is one of the roles I hope to see filled by the new Peacebuilding Commission, which I hope Member States will agree to create at the world summit to be held in September. That Commission should help to sustain the international focus on peacebuilding tasks in countries that, thanks to the cessation of active hostilities, are no longer intensively covered in the news media. By bringing together the different international and regional actors involved in such countries, the Commission would, and should, harmonize peacebuilding activities across the multilateral system.

As an advisory body, the Commission would neither encroach upon the authority nor dilute the responsibility of the Council. No matter how effective the Commission may be, the members of the Council will continue to bear the responsibility for devising and

adopting the mandates under which the United Nations operates in war-torn countries. The Council will therefore still have the responsibility of ensuring that those mandates are both broad and long enough to give affected countries a real chance of developing the institutions and attitudes needed to sustain the rule of law. Only when that is achieved can a country hope to break decisively with the cycle of violence.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

Mr. Guéhenno: Please allow me to begin with a word of thanks to the Greek presidency for convening this thematic debate and for inviting me to contribute to one aspect of it, namely, the challenges currently faced by United Nations peacekeeping operations in promoting the rule of law, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) and security-sector reform in post-conflict situations. I would like to take this opportunity to focus in particular on the interlinkages among those three issues and on the need for more focused discussion of security-sector reform, which has received little attention in such forums in the past. The challenges in this area are indeed formidable. But, before delving into the details, I would like to make three general observations.

First, the good news: the total number of active armed conflicts in the world is actually in steady decline. In fact, the 28 or so countries of the world currently affected by some form of active armed conflict represent a 30-year low. The Security Council lies at the heart of that decline, particularly since the end of the cold war. The members of this body have seized opportunities to broker agreements to end civil wars and to send multidimensional peacekeeping operations to assist with their implementation. In several of those cases — Namibia, El Salvador, Mozambique and Cambodia, for example — peace prevails, albeit amid other serious challenges facing those countries more than a decade after United Nations peacekeepers departed.

One hopes that 10 years from now the same will be said about Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone. The Peacebuilding Commission proposed by the Secretary-General, if created, could certainly help increase that likelihood by ensuring sustained and coordinated international attention in the post-peacekeeping phase.

Second, while there are enough examples to demonstrate that this is not mission impossible, there should be no illusions about how difficult and precarious the undertaking is. The tragedy of Srebrenica, to which the Secretary-General just referred, still serves as a constant reminder ten years later of how an already dire situation can descend into conscience-shocking acts of savagery in a matter of days or hours. When we think that the worst is over, it is important to remember precisely at that point that the threat of mass killings, new waves of ethnic cleansing and/or the resumption of full-scale hostilities is likely still present in many peacekeeping contexts. Small missteps and the misreading of events can spell disaster, and they have.

Moreover, the jobs are getting increasingly difficult. Although no one associated with the operations in Mozambique or Cambodia would ever say that those were easy cases, they now appear to be so, relative to the scale, scope and complexity of the challenges United Nations peace operations currently face in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Sudan, for example.

In order to be better prepared for the unexpected, the High-level Panel and the Secretary-General have recommended the creation of a strategic reserve capacity, ready to be called upon on short notice to reinforce a mission facing an unforeseen crisis. One of the highest priorities of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in the coming year is to work with Member States to define the concept of operations of the strategic reserve.

Third, however robust United Nations peacekeeping operations military capabilities might be, they alone cannot ensure security in post-conflict environments absent the right political strategy and the political will of the relevant national and international actors. As a result of either international or internal pressure — or both — the main protagonists to the conflict must be ready to make the painful political and personal compromises necessary to maintain peace. They must transform themselves into leaders or give way to others able and willing to do the things required in order to engender the trust of former enemies, bring a war-torn society together around a common agenda and steer the delicate balance between promoting national reconciliation and unity, on the one hand, and accountability for war crimes and grave abuses of human rights on the other.

Those exceptionally trying demands require exceptional individuals to step forward. No amount of international assistance in the areas of the rule of law, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and security sector reform can substitute for effective national leadership. If the basis for political compromise at the national and international level is wanting, in all likelihood a United Nations peacekeeping operation will be fighting an uphill battle, to put it mildly, to maintain a secure environment.

I have offered those three observations up front to stress that the right political context is often a necessary precondition for achieving a secure environment in a post-conflict setting. But while it may be a necessary condition, it is not a sufficient condition. Much more work is actually required in the field of national institution-building. Indeed, a country emerging from conflict cannot hope to consolidate peace, develop sustainable institutions or achieve economic prosperity if its citizens are too fearful to walk freely in the streets or lack access to social and legal services or political processes. Nor can a State rebuild itself and avoid a relapse into conflict if its population is threatened by police, armed forces or intelligence units that are not held accountable and are unprofessional, poorly resourced and poorly disciplined, untrained in international standards or lacking in effective management and oversight structures. And although stabilization in the immediate aftermath of conflict is a critical aspect of security, longer-term efforts addressing the entire range of security actors and judicial and law enforcement institutions are just as critical, if not more so.

In short, if peace is to be lasting, the short-, medium- and long-term security and justice needs of both the State and its population must be addressed equally. On those fronts, there are several areas that deserve further study and potential improvement.

First, our efforts in the security and justice sectors have tended to be driven by peace agreements, which address those issues in the context of ending a conflict. As during the conflict, parties to the agreement are often driven by their own personal agendas, and those do not always reflect all the elements that are crucial for sustainable peace. Peace agreements articulate in some detail the incorporation of militia forces into a new police force or army, the apportionment of senior-level appointments among warring factions and the harmonization of ranks.

However, those elements, while important, do not lay a strong basis for the consolidation of State and human security in the post-conflict setting. Insufficient attention is accorded to a comprehensive national security review process to identify the threats, whether internal or external, to State and human security and the development of a security architecture that is responsive to identified threats. As a result, both the international community and the host countries are ill prepared to tackle critical challenges such as corruption, cross-border narcotics and arms and human trafficking. Peace-agreement-driven approaches have in some instances even led the international community to support the reform of State institutions that had lost their legitimacy in the eyes of the population. It is therefore not surprising that those same countries have had a high propensity for relapsing into conflict.

Secondly, as in many other areas of peacebuilding, international efforts related to the security and the justice sectors are often disjointed. First, the United Nations bilateral donors and other actors at times pursue their own objectives without buying into a single agreed-upon framework or approach, and, due to competition for donor funds, the various actors are often not forthcoming about the projects that they are planning, which leads to uneven or duplicative assistance.

Thirdly, within the United Nations there is no agreement on a single system-wide approach on these issues. In some cases, we have specific operational capacities in one part of the system, whereas the corresponding capacity to support management, oversight and accountability mechanisms may be non-existent or lie in a different part of the United Nations system. In other key areas, such as defence reform or some aspects of the justice sector, capacity is altogether lacking. That has led to an absence of strategic coherence among the various links in the chain of activities.

Fourthly, international approaches in support of security sector reform in post-conflict countries often apply foreign models and standards, which may be politically unpalatable or, practically speaking, unsuitable or unrealistic in the light of the realities on the ground.

And finally, existing approaches tend to be more applicable to developing countries than to post-conflict countries, as those approaches involve lengthy processes that are not tailored to situations where the

road map for political and institutional change is often set out in a negotiated and time-limited peace agreement.

In seeking to address those challenges, the international community might reconsider whether it is always realistic to seek to rebuild, reform or restructure a country's defence, police, courts and penal system while simultaneously seeking to re-establish security, keep the political process on track, facilitate the return of displaced populations, conduct elections and restore basic services.

In some cases, it may be appropriate to start early on complex tasks such as rebuilding courts and training police so that we do not miss the window of opportunity for action. Otherwise, violent, corrupt and inept approaches may become entrenched, and we may later have little or no opportunity to have a significant impact. In other cases, however, we may need to re-examine the sequence of activities so that the peacekeeping operation focuses on stabilization while a proper assessment of threats and needs is conducted and appropriate international, regional and local partners are identified to rebuild the security infrastructure and institutions in a sustainable fashion. We need to think these questions through carefully so as to ensure that we spend our efforts and resources on viable processes and institutions that can be sustained beyond the brief lifespan of a peacekeeping operation.

For the United Nations system, another key to better delivery is to continue to strive to carry out our mandates in as integrated a manner as possible. We have recognized that strong synergies and links exist between the development and security agendas, but we must make greater strides in integrating our development partners at the initial stages of planning for peacekeeping operations. That would ensure that our joint efforts are guided by a coherent, long-term strategy, and would allow smooth handovers to national and development partners once the peacekeeping mandate is over. We must ensure that we involve not only technical experts, but also civilians and others with a big-picture perspective, in our strategic and operational planning and activities.

At the same time, we must seek the greater integration of capacities within the United Nations system, which would require the assignment of clear responsibility for specific activities; the development of repositories of best practices, including diverse models of reforming the security sector; and effective coordination that brings together United Nations, bilateral and other efforts, including with respect to resource mobilization.

Equally, we must differentiate between areas where the United Nations system has, or should further develop, the capacity to carry out operational tasks and deliver programmes, and other areas where we could most usefully engage knowledgeably with host countries and bilateral and multilateral partners that have the requisite experience or capacity. As such, our role would be to advocate for assistance from those with something to offer and to ensure that what is promised and delivered responds to the actual needs of the host country. One key area that deserves examination is defence reform, where the United Nations currently has limited capacity.

As we reflect on how the United Nations might better contribute to the justice and security sectors in post-conflict environments, we might build on our recent experience in the area of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), which also involves multi-actor, multidimensional activities that stretch beyond the lifespan of a peacekeeping mission.

In April 2004, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations initiated an inter-agency process that brought together 14 United Nations departments, agencies, funds and programmes to jointly develop a set of policies, guidelines and procedures called the integrated DDR standards. Although that is a United Nations process, we also tapped into the rich experience of the beneficiaries of DDR programmes, Member States, non-governmental organizations and the World Bank. In one year, the inter-agency working group has developed a comprehensive set of 30 DDR models that cover the full spectrum from strategic to tactical-level issues. We have consulted the drafts widely, tested them in an inter-agency simulation exercise, piloted them in our Haiti and Sudan peacekeeping missions and made significant improvements in the way that DDR programmes are funded. We expect to publish the first edition of the standards, which will lay out the agreed United Nations approach for DDR, this fall.

That substantive guidance on DDR will be available to all those who need it in the international community. In addition, the inter-agency working group on DDR is developing a Web-based United

Nations resource centre and a joint training strategy for DDR practitioners.

On the basis of this agreed United Nations approach to DDR, we are now well placed to streamline our activities, maximize our effectiveness and minimize unnecessary duplication at Headquarters and in the field. It may be worth exploring whether United Nations efforts in the justice and security sectors might benefit from a similar comprehensive approach. Of course, that would require expertise and resources which the United Nations does not currently have.

We are fortunate that our multidimensional peacekeeping operations generally have solid mandates to support justice- and security-related programmes on the ground, even if we often experience shortfalls in staffing and funding. A greater focus by the Security Council on the specific DDR, rule-of-law and security-related needs in particular settings would provide us with even stronger and more precise mandates that would better address the needs of post-conflict countries. In the meantime, the United Nations system must continue to work on rationalizing its approaches, integrating its resources and capacities and delivering a single and comprehensive United Nations response for the Governments and populations that we are called upon to assist. That would also enable the United Nations system to maintain the level of political attention that is needed and to draw upon donor funding in a coordinated manner. The reform or formation of national security and justice sectors requires long-term commitment. A single United Nations approach is surely the best way to ensure the coherence and sustainability of these efforts well after the peacekeepers have left the country.

The President: I thank Mr. Guéhenno for his statement.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I shall give the floor to three Council members, followed by two non-Council members. I shall follow that alternating arrangement until the list of speakers is exhausted.

I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate their texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

As a measure to optimize the use of our time in order to allow as many delegations as possible to take the floor, I will not individually invite speakers to take seats at the table or to resume their seats at the side of the Chamber. When a speaker is taking the floor, the Conference Officer will seat the next speaker on the list at the table.

I thank participants for their understanding and cooperation.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): I would like to express the special satisfaction of the delegation of Brazil at seeing you, Mr. Minister, presiding over the work of the Security Council on this timely and important item. I am also grateful to the delegation of Greece for the very useful background paper that it has provided as a basis for our discussions today.

This meeting of the Security Council provides clear evidence of the growing international awareness of the need to strengthen our capacity to respond to international humanitarian crises. Brazil is pleased to see notions such as conflict prevention and peacebuilding, which arose some 10 years ago, being firmly incorporated into the United Nations agenda. The United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, must adapt to contemporary realities and be better equipped, at both the institutional and the conceptual levels, in order adequately to address fast-increasing contemporary challenges and threats. Such ideas are likely to be reflected in the important decisions that our Governments are to take in the coming months through the end of 2005. Brazil is firmly committed to this opportunity to improve, in a comprehensive manner, the collective security mechanism, rendering it more effective and more efficient.

Efforts by the Security Council to break conflict cycles and to prevent relapses in the context of humanitarian crises have had mixed results in recent years. It is therefore important to look at the lessons learned so as to identify winning strategies, as well as shortcomings, in our approach, as your delegation, Mr. President, has proposed. First — this can never be overstated — we must resist the temptation of one-size-fits-all policies.

Every situation is characterized by cultural, political, social, economic and sometimes religious diversities. Information is a key requirement, and the Council can certainly benefit from views on various situations, not only from the Secretariat, as we do, but

also from individual Members, especially those from the regions affected, and from the regional and subregional organizations directly involved.

A second aspect is to recognize the complexity of the tasks to be undertaken. Recent issues under consideration by the Council tend to demonstrate that, in parallel with security-oriented efforts, growing attention should necessarily be given to promoting democratic institutions, dialogue and national reconciliation and to addressing the social and economic roots of conflict. That is why Brazil and other States have, throughout the years, advocated greater and more systematic coordination between the Council and other United Nations organs as well as other international actors.

Ultimately, we believe, peace is contingent not only on political and security factors, but also on economic development with justice and on the provision of equal opportunity for all. An effective collective system should therefore be based on a comprehensive vision that can be sustainable in the long term. The proposed creation of a Peacebuilding Commission — by including the Economic and Social Council and the Bretton Woods institutions, as well as other stakeholders — can help to bridge the institutional gaps we face in the social and economic fields. We certainly favour the ongoing debate on issues related to transition and on the need to address the funding and strategic planning gap between relief and development, particularly in post-conflict settings.

Prevalence of the rule of law, the strengthening of national security sectors and programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) can be catalysts for the promotion of economic development and justice.

National ownership of the transition process from the end of a conflict to the attainment of lasting peace and sustainable development is crucial. My country is committed to the establishment of a democracy fund at the United Nations.

In post-conflict situations, it is essential that national pacts be forged, fostering inclusiveness and participation. Such arrangements should be freely discussed and should aim at long-term stability. The institutions to be established should be based on compromise and common interest.

The rule of law must be absolutely consistent with international human rights norms and standards, and the rights of victims and vulnerable groups must be fully upheld. In fragile post-conflict settings, an independent, impartial, accountable and effective judiciary system is, we believe, indispensable.

Tangible results can be achieved only with the necessary financial resources and highly qualified personnel for a solid investment in justice and the rule of law. In addition, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights should be given more resources to work with countries in order to strengthen the institutions that uphold the rule of law.

Over the years, the Council has applied various modalities in promoting justice and addressing abuses in order to achieve reconciliation. Those modalities include the strengthening of local courts, support for truth commissions, the establishment of international tribunals, support for the establishment of mixed tribunals and referral to the International Criminal Court. Yet the dynamics are different in every experience. Local ownership and local consultation are crucial, as the Secretary-General stressed this morning. True reconciliation may require a delicate balance between the values of justice and those of peace, however difficult that may be to achieve.

Reform of the security sector through the restructuring and training of military and civilian police forces is also essential. Foreign assistance — financial, technical or both — can prove to be useful and positive. But our attempts should also seek to ensure that security forces, like governmental institutions at any other level, are sensitive to the views of society at large. Most important, they should be clearly subordinate to civilian oversight.

DDR activities and their variants, including resettlement and repatriation, are a matter of the highest importance. The core components of DDR programmes should be funded from the assessed budget for peacekeeping operations in order to guarantee predictable funding. As a matter of fact, DDR programmes remain continuously under-resourced, especially in the reintegration phase. Experience shows that effective alternatives for subsistence should be provided to ex-combatants. In that connection, we stress the importance of quick-impact projects on the ground that can provide affordable housing for them. Providing affordable housing is a key element of peacebuilding. Reintegration into civilian life will be effective only if

conditions are provided that enable ex-combatants to live in safety, to participate in the political process and to pursue economic activities that yield social benefits.

As I stated at the outset, the Council has a mixed record in undertaking these activities. I would add that that is not necessarily the fault of the Council itself, but rather is a symptom of the deficiencies of an inadequate structure that Member States are now willing to correct. Considering the current needs in this field, we also believe that States that are in a position to assist should seek to formulate new policies and create or revamp their domestic institutions for that purpose. Enhanced participation by as many States as possible in that process would have beneficial effects, including that of providing options for the countries to be assisted. This is a potential area for international cooperation with the participation of the Secretariat, including the appropriate United Nations programmes and agencies.

My delegation is thankful for this opportunity to address, in wider terms, the challenges that the Security Council has to address in its daily work. This is a task that the Council must undertake in order to comply with its mandate, and we must be adequately prepared and equipped in order to perform effectively.

Mr. Osmane (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Permit me at the outset to welcome you among us, Mr. Minister, and to congratulate your country and your delegation on having organized a debate on an extremely sensitive issue that the Security Council has been compelled by circumstances to address: humanitarian crises generated by armed conflict. I also thank the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations for his very interesting briefing.

Over the past 15 years, the world has experienced very serious conflicts that have shattered the lives of tens of millions of individuals, causing mass population movements, exposing millions of women and children to every kind of danger and generating often unbearable humanitarian crises. Given that situation, the United Nations, including the Security Council, has a responsibility to shoulder and a role to play, together with the agencies and institutions that are competent in this area.

Therefore, the Security Council's addressing the humanitarian dimension of crises and conflicts through peacekeeping and peacebuilding is a development that we must welcome. We are also pleased that coordination among the political, humanitarian, military and socio-economic sectors is recognized as essential in the prevention of conflict and the establishment of lasting peace.

The crises of the past 15 years have shown that the transition between the phase of intervention by the international community and that of rehabilitation, recovery and reconstruction can be fragile and sometimes inadequate. Although there are situations that provide reasons for satisfaction regarding the progress made in transitional processes, we must note that there are others in which efforts have not been fully successful, particularly in the three key areas that we are discussing in today's debate: the rule of law, security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR).

In that regard, it is important that our overall action with respect to managing post-conflict situations be shaped by holistic strategies; as it devises the mandates of peacekeeping missions, the Security Council can and must play a leading role. Such strategies should incorporate broad support for social and economic intervention aimed at avoiding the recurrence of conflict as well as reform of the security and transitional justice sectors, reductions in small arms and light weapons, the disarmament and demobilization of former combatants and the protection of civilians, in particular vulnerable groups.

The restoration and strengthening of the rule of law, good governance, the promotion and protection of human rights, the fight against impunity, respect for international humanitarian law and the promotion of a culture of peace and tolerance all continue to be of fundamental importance. Strengthening the justice and security sectors in crisis situations or in areas emerging from conflict is also crucial. Further, it is important to stress the development dimension in peacebuilding in countries in crisis or emerging from conflict, as well as to build the relationship between development and peacebuilding; that is a task for the entire United Nations system.

Here, we stress once again the need for in-depth study of the root causes of the conflicts and humanitarian crises that are shaking the planet, in particular the African continent, and to work to contain them. In that connection, I want to emphasize again the key role of regional and subregional organizations both in conflict prevention and in peacebuilding.

Implementing a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention remains the most effective — and unquestionably the most economical — way to avoid the humanitarian tragedies brought about by conflict. To do this, the international community must be vigilant and must stand ready to provide support to vulnerable countries. Such support must be coordinated and multidimensional. It must also be timely and must continue until the threat is dispelled once and for all.

But although the Security Council has a role to play, it cannot, by virtue of its mandate, always try to do everything, everywhere. In our view, the Peacebuilding Commission — whose role, mandate and place within the United Nations are now under discussion within the Organization — could be the appropriate body for crafting and implementing strategies for addressing pre-conflict and post-conflict situations, including in their humanitarian aspects, in a consistent and integrated manner. My delegation is ready to contribute to that discussion in an open and constructive way.

Finally, we thank the Greek delegation for preparing the draft presidential statement before us today; we support it fully.

Mr. Mayoral (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, Mr. Minister, my delegation thanks you for convening this debate on the challenges, lessons learned and the way ahead of the Security Council in tackling humanitarian crises. We are of the view that the Security Council has the responsibility to learn from past experience in order to contribute to the maintenance of peace.

In recent years, there has unfortunately been a sudden surge in peacekeeping operations and an increase in the complexity of their mandates, in which there is now an attempt to incorporate innovative elements as a way to help create safer and more stable environments. Such new elements are part of a new generation of peace operations aimed at averting the return of violence through a preventive strategy intended to deter ex-combatants and to convince them that it is right that they should be integrated into a democratic society.

Such an approach requires that all participants in the process be able to agree on a concrete plan that provides them with ways to cooperate. Inevitably, there are many and varied actors involved in the process of peacebuilding; this adds yet another element of complexity that we must not neglect.

Undoubtedly, national societies bear primary responsibility in the search for peace. Nonetheless, for States marked by the extreme poverty of their population and by a lack of sufficient institutional capacity to break out of the vicious circle of violence, international assistance proves not only necessary but also decisive. In such contexts, we consider that the Security Council has a key role to play in the design and development of a peace process. In our view, the Council has an important function in coordinating the efforts of the various actors and in avoiding unnecessary duplication, all with a view to optimizing the efficiency of the peace initiatives.

The international community's interest in addressing the root causes of conflict is reflected in current field activities of the United Nations, in numerous peacekeeping operations, on issues related to the rule of law, security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR).

We consider that the strengthening of the institutions of the rule of law is an outstanding way to bring justice to societies in which impunity prevailed. We consider that reform of police institutions and of the structures responsible for law and order is essential to ensure that the fight against illegality and arbitrariness is conducted strictly within the framework of international standards and with full respect for human rights. We believe also that a comprehensive process of DDR in societies characterized by intolerance helps build trust and promotes the creation of mechanisms that help restore the social fabric.

All those concepts are aimed at broadening the traditional approach to peacebuilding. It is no longer simply a matter of responding to the outbreak of armed conflict, but rather of improving a society's own capacity to reconcile and of strengthening its ability to deal with its conflicts without violence. The joint and coordinated implementation of programmes in all these areas reduces — and can further reduce — the incidence of scattered and parallel efforts and can contribute to laying the foundations of stability.

We believe that the Secretariat could assemble a compendium of best practices to facilitate the future work of the Security Council. Along those lines, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, at its session held in January and February, encouraged the Secretariat to develop coherent strategies and early integrated mission planning based on lessons learned.

Lessons from missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Timor-Leste, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire and Haiti could be of the utmost importance. The analyses submitted by technical missions to organize the launching of a peace operation could include early assessments of the status of the local judicial, correctional and police systems, so as to provide troop-contributing countries with a more comprehensive picture regarding the issues that require urgent attention.

From this perspective, the potential of the regional training centres for Blue Helmets should be better used both to spread new ideas and concepts on multidimensional operations and to integrate the specific views and knowledge of different cultural and geographical areas.

We believe that the unified standards on DDR now being developed will be extremely useful in preparing activities in this regard. We also believe that the inclusion in DDR of all women and children associated with armed forces and groups, taking into account their specific needs, should be part of those unified guidelines. We should provide for the early and foreseeable funding of all the components of the process as a means of ensuring a horizon of certainty for all the actors involved.

As we have indicated on other occasions, our delegation firmly supports the Secretary-General's proposal to create a Peacebuilding Commission that would be charge of analysing in detail all these sensitive and important issues.

In conclusion, may I point out that it is the responsibility of States to be coherent and determined when adopting peacebuilding measures. Therefore, Security Council decisions on this issue must be supported and facilitated both within the United Nations — for example, in the respective committees of the General Assembly — and in the agencies that are part of the system. In this last regard, we believe that the contribution of international financial institutions must be encouraged, since that could be crucial to the success of the peace processes — although in many cases the strict conditions that they impose cause reconstruction and development efforts to fail.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. De Rivero (Peru) *(spoke in Spanish)*: First, I wish to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, Mr. Petros Molyviatis, and his delegation for having proposed an open debate on the timely and important problem of humanitarian crises.

There is no doubt that the humanitarian crises confronting the Security Council are largely due to the proliferation of civil conflicts following the cold war. In fact, since the cold war, more than 33 internal civil conflicts have erupted or have been re-activated and have cost over 5 million lives and have left almost 17 million people as refugees or displaced persons.

We believe that the Council has three main functions when facing humanitarian crises. The first is to prevent a humanitarian crisis, and that means preventing the conflict. The second is to respond to a crisis. That response includes diplomatic measures, enforcement action, sanctions and, in extreme cases, military intervention. The third function is to direct reconciliation and the reconstruction of the collapsed country. That means modernization of the economy and building or rebuilding democracy.

One lesson that we must learn from humanitarian crises is that, as we have said, they are the result of civil conflicts caused mainly by social exclusion. Therefore it is no coincidence that most humanitarian crises now under consideration in the Security Council occur in countries where personal income has not grown more that 2 per cent over the last thirty years. Those countries — which in addition have an explosive population growth, especially the urban population, and export only primary products and are technologically very backward — have been left out of the global flows of trade, investment and technological innovation. Therefore they have become indebted in order to buy the progress that they are not able to produce. In other words, they are becoming almost unviable national economies.

We must understand that behind the conflicts that cause humanitarian crises are those unviable national economies, which produce a great deal of social exclusion, which in turn exacerbates political instability and ethnic and religious conflict to the point of turning the country into a failed State. In the face of this reality, it is thus necessary to introduce in the Security Council measures that strengthen its preventive capacities so that it can identify, in coordination with the Economic and Social Council

and the Bretton Woods organizations, which countries are at risk of becoming failed States. The Council should be a kind of early-warning mechanism so that countries experiencing political instability can immediately be given economic and financial intensive care by the international community so that humanitarian crises can be averted. That intensive care would focus above all on debt forgiveness and on a massive increase in assistance in order to meet the most urgent social demands and thus provide political stability.

To improve the Security Council's response to humanitarian crises, we believe that its five permanent members could arrive at a gentlemen's agreement not to use the veto when it is a question of crises involving crimes against humanity such as massive violations of human rights, ethnic cleansing and genocide. That gentlemen's agreement would function in cases presented by the Secretary-General and supported by reports from the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretariat's Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. The idea is that the permanent members of the Council would cooperate in the face of a request from the international community by not using the veto against Council operations that could save thousands of lives.

Nonetheless, such a gentlemen's agreement will serve no point if the Security Council's peacekeeping or peace enforcement capacity is weakened because of a lack of recruitment or because of shortcomings on the part of recruited troops and if the United Nations forces are not deployed quickly.

For all those reasons the Security Council, in order to improve its response capacity, should endorse the recommendations of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change that ask those countries that have greater military capacity to make available to the United Nations autonomous reserve battalions with a high level of preparation and self-sufficiency. They might be as large as a brigade in size.

As for reconciliation and the reconstruction of failed States, the Security Council should ensure that reconstruction does not simply rebuild an unviable economy based on the export of primary commodities and with low technological capacity. If it does, the State concerned will not be able to count on sufficient resources for a growing population and social exclusion will continue to recreate instability, civil conflict and humanitarian crises.

The most important aspect of the Council's role in reconstruction and reconciliation, however, is the establishment of democratic institutionality, which should begin at the local level. The first essential task is the establishment of local democratic Governments. Democracy must rise from the local to the regional level and from the regional to the national. Thus, it will emanate from the people to the local and State authorities.

It can be said today that humanitarian work has virtually become the principal activity of the United Nations. That may seem quite normal to us here, but it is seen very differently by analysts of international relations. In fact, as they see it, the expansion of the United Nations humanitarian activity is very clear evidence that the Security Council is failing to fulfil its primary mandate to maintain international peace and security because it is unable to prevent and to resolve conflicts. They believe that the United Nations is expanding its humanitarian work for want of a better alternative.

That does not mean, of course, that we ought not address humanitarian crises, but the magnitude and recurrence of tragic humanitarian situations cannot and must not cause us to forget that the principal work of the United Nations and the Security Council is effectively to prevent and adequately to respond to civil conflicts in order to avoid humanitarian crises.

In conclusion, I cannot fail to note that, if we do not adopt measures to strengthen the functions of the Security Council in preventing and responding to conflicts and humanitarian crises, and if we merely convene open debates, we run the risk of repeating the events of 1453, when, in Byzantium, the doctors of the faith were debating the issue of whether angels have a gender at the very moment when the enemy army was at the gates of Constantinople. Our discussions here must be neither an impediment to action nor unproductive exercises or dialogues; rather, they must constitute a brief reflection, since we have a great deal to do in Darfur.

Mr. Sen (India): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July 2005. The agenda of the Council for the month is indicative of the important issues that the Council is called upon to deal with. I have no doubt that those issues will receive the most careful consideration under your stellar leadership.

As we are taking the floor for the first time this month, I would like to convey, on my own behalf and on behalf of the Government and people of India, our deep condolences and sympathy to the Government and people of the United Kingdom for the tragedy that has resulted from the terrorist attacks in London. Those reprehensible acts are a crime not just against the United Kingdom, but against all humanity. The horror perpetrated in London will remain etched on the collective consciousness of the world as a signal that terrorism has become one of the greatest threats of our times. It is not constrained by distance and resources, nor restricted by boundaries, nor bound by any civilized norms in wreaking devastation. The world community must rise as one to respond decisively to that collective challenge to the peace, security and progress of all mankind.

I wish to thank you, Sir, for scheduling this open meeting of the Security Council today. The regular participation of the general membership in Council debates on important issues under its consideration is a step towards the desired goal of achieving greater transparency and inclusiveness in the work of the Council.

The theme of the debate today is one that has been discussed on a number of occasions by the Council under different nomenclatures. My delegation has participated in several open debates on related issues and our position on those is well-known. In recent months, the consideration of this and related issues under the rubric of reform of the United Nations, based particularly on the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change and the Secretary-General's "In larger freedom" report, has enabled a fresh airing of views on the subject.

We believe that the topic of this debate belongs more to the General Assembly, as it revolves around more than one issue, such as the implementation of humanitarian law, the rule of law in conflict situations, and capacity-building of States in conflict or those emerging from conflict. I believe, however, that you have more than redressed the balance, Sir, through the idealism and reason that you have brought to bear on the consideration of those issues, which is a characteristic of Hellenic civilization, and the method of conducting the work that you have adopted. If you will permit a Christian metaphor, this, I hope, will remain as a rock on which the future working practices of the Security Council will be built and will remain a model for the future.

India has on several occasions expressed its reservations on intrusive monitoring and finger-pointing while dealing with specific human rights situations in individual countries. That principle applies equally in cases of violation of humanitarian law. We remain convinced of the essential validity of an approach that is based on dialogue, consultation and cooperation leading to genuine improvements in a situation where violations of human rights law and humanitarian law are addressed without any external interference.

We have on earlier occasions also made it clear that any discussion which is used as a cover for conferring legitimacy on the so-called right of humanitarian intervention or for making it the ideology of some kind of military humanism is unacceptable. We believe that, in the case of humanitarian crises manifested in the form of genocide and gross violations of human rights and humanitarian law, no amount of sophistry can substitute for the lack of political will among major Powers.

There is, in fact, a very troubling pattern usually ignored or not acknowledged. In several countries, because of the suspicion now engendered that humanitarian assistance is driven by political motives and that those who take humanitarian action also take sides, parties to a conflict have either targeted humanitarian workers or those they work for, or refused them access. Those fears can only be allayed if humanitarian assistance returns to its roots and humanitarian action is seen as apolitical, neutral and offered at request, in accordance with the guiding principles so clearly enunciated by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/182.

We are not certain if an investigation of the reasons behind countries' relapsing into conflict would serve much useful purpose. There may be a variety of reasons that drag countries into a state of armed conflict. It is well-known that transitional situations are complex and country-specific. However, the single most effective instrument for helping countries not to relapse into conflict, to our mind, would be development. It is widely acknowledged that development assistance to post-conflict countries can help to stabilize the situation and provide the time needed for building national institutions.

General Assembly resolution 59/250 on the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system urged the United Nations agencies and the donor community, in coordination with national authorities, to begin planning the transition to development and taking measures supportive of that transition, such as institutional and capacity-building, from the beginning of the relief phase. The resolution stresses the need for transitional activities to be undertaken under national ownership through the development of national capacities at all levels to manage the transition process. We feel that the United Nations system as a whole must look at the issue of national development as a priority in post-conflict situations. The effort should be to develop national capacity and promote national ownership.

Countries in post-conflict situations would also benefit from sharing experiences and expertise from other developing countries. South-South cooperation modalities, including triangular cooperation modalities, should form an important component of the development of post-conflict countries. The use of information technologies and knowledge-management systems, as well as the exchange of expertise, should be facilitated to enable post-conflict countries that have emerged from conflict to take advantage of the experience of other developing countries.

There is a general understanding among the membership today that the international community can no longer remain silent in the event of gross and egregious violations of human rights or of genocide. A humanitarian crisis can also be the result of famine, drought, natural calamity, infectious disease and a host of other factors. Under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, the Council has the authority to intervene where it deems necessary. Yet there continue to be doubts about the political objectivity of decisions that empower States to act against others in the light of humanitarian crises.

Mr. Denisov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are pleased to welcome you to the President's chair, Mr. Minister.

The theme of today's discussion is relevant in the context of the activities of the Security Council. Experience has shown us that the attainment of lasting peace and the resolution of regional conflicts are possible only on the basis of a comprehensive approach.

United Nations peacekeeping activities are becoming increasingly complex and multidimensional. The Organization has made considerable progress in resolving a number of complex conflicts. In every case, success was due in large part to the effective combination of the peacekeeping and peacebuilding tools of the United Nations and the close coordination of the military, political, civilian, reconstruction and humanitarian components of operations.

Each crisis situation is unique in its own way; there is no one-size-fits-all model of peacekeeping that can be applied to all conflicts. Each case requires selecting the optimal set of peacekeeping instruments — be they United Nations, coalition or regional operations. Such an effort must be structured in strict accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which clearly sets out the political role of the Security Council in all stages of a peacekeeping operation, from drafting the mandate to the transition to peacebuilding. The Charter and international legal standards give the Council the ability to act on behalf of the international community and to take appropriate measures to prevent or end genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and other massive abuses of human rights that pose a threat to international peace and security.

Russia is prepared to cooperate closely with all interested international partners to strengthen the leading role of the United Nations in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and humanitarian crises, as well as to enhance the effectiveness of the activities of the United Nations in the interest of building lasting global security and stability.

The Russian delegation supports the draft presidential statement that has been prepared by the Greek delegation and which has been agreed by all members of the Council.

Ms. Løj (Denmark): My delegation wishes to thank the Greek presidency for organizing this debate. We would also like to thank you, Mr. Minister, for presiding over our meeting today. This debate is a useful follow-up to those held by the Security Council in May and June of this year on the subjects of post-conflict peacebuilding and the protection of civilians in armed conflict.

Denmark aligns itself with the statement to be delivered later by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union.

Many of the Security Council's actions are in response to humanitarian crisis caused by conflict. In maintaining international peace and security, the Council's main objective is to save human lives and spare people from further suffering. That objective was fully met in two success stories of United Nations intervention, namely, the cases of Timor-Leste and Bougainville. Unfortunately, other interventions have not yet had the same positive outcome, and human suffering continues in places like Haiti, Sudan and Côte d'Ivoire.

We must aim to improve our efforts to prevent countries from relapsing into conflict. If we are not able to act swiftly in the immediate post-conflict phase, we may miss the window of opportunity and more human lives will be lost.

Even if there is no standard formula by which every conflict can be resolved, there certainly is a checklist based on lessons learned that can help us get off to a good start. The three pillars mentioned in the presidency's discussion paper for this debate are all on the checklist. The rule of law, security-sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes are vital parts of every peacebuilding strategy, as they address the fundamental causes of most conflicts.

To improve our work, we must develop individual peacebuilding strategies for every conflict. In the mandates for United Nations operations, the Security Council must address overall needs and ensure that the main elements of the checklist are included. As a supervisor of its own decisions, the Council must always stand ready to re-examine a conflict situation on the basis of relevant advice and adjust its mandate accordingly.

The proposal to establish a Peacebuilding Commission addresses many of those concerns. By bringing together local and regional partners, donors and providers of security, we can create a unique environment for developing strategy and for setting priorities in a way that is both implementable and sustainable. Allow me to give a few examples to illustrate the complementary and useful nature of a Peacebuilding Commission in relation to our discussion today.

While the Security Council can only appeal to donors to fund certain activities, the Peacebuilding Commission can address specific gaps and, hopefully, fill them. While the Security-Council would normally condemn trafficking of soldiers across borders, the Peacebuilding Commission can discuss useful measures to stop it with regional partners. While the Security Council can encourage quick-win projects, the Peacebuilding Commission can make them part of the priorities.

It is important to develop comprehensive strategies if we wish to preserve peace and find solutions to humanitarian crises. The root causes of conflict do not disappear with peacekeeping alone, and development will not happen without security. That interconnection demands the inclusion of many actors and instruments unique to every specific conflict. The complexity and the many interests and concerns involved call for the United Nations to be in charge of coordination.

There is responsibility to be borne at every level. The Security Council is the highest global level of political and strategic decision-making. It bears the responsibility to adopt mandates that allow the necessary steps to be taken to attain sustainable peace. As another strategic body, a Peacebuilding Commission — being one step closer to actual implementation in the field, due to its composition — can more effectively coordinate specific issues and ensure that every necessary task is accounted for in a peacebuilding strategy.

In the end, the work done in the field by United Nations peacekeepers, United Nations agencies, local and regional partners, bilateral donors and other contributors remains the centre of gravity. All we do, and all the decisions we take, must aim at improving the situation on the ground. The only way to measure the success of our common efforts is by improvements in the situation for the human lives to which we are all accountable.

Mr. Baja (Philippines): We are honoured that you, Mr. Foreign Minister, are presiding over this important meeting, and we congratulate the Greek delegation for convening an open debate of the Security Council on the Council's role in humanitarian crises. We were enriched on this issue by your concept paper and your statement, as well as by the statements of the Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General Guéhenno.

Recent developments have shown that the Council is increasingly involved in humanitarian issues

in the context of its mandate to protect and enhance international peace. Our meeting today is therefore timely and relevant.

We agree that the promotion of the rule of law, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) process and security sector reform are key pillars to be addressed during the post-conflict peacebuilding stage in order to arrest humanitarian crises and prevent the resumption of conflict. To appreciate and understand the importance of addressing those three pillars, it is best to look at the historical experience of the conflict situations that the Council has been asked to consider. There are multiple realities and lessons learned from past and current peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities.

First, as stated by the Russian Federation delegation, there are no quick fixes or one-size-fits-all formulas for addressing the issue. Responses vary among conflict situations. The Under-Secretary-General referred to best practices and best models; it would be helpful to share those experiences and that expertise.

Secondly, the response to and the assistance in conscience-shocking humanitarian crises are more immediate than is the case in other crises. As a corollary, the response to and the assistance in those crises become effective when humanitarian and strategic interests coincide. Selective responses could, and did, occur in the past.

Third, it is best that the mechanisms and the processes for responding to humanitarian crises accompany an internal process with roots in the specific experiences of the society concerned. The complex reality of socio-economic circumstances on the ground cannot be ignored. In that connection, the participation of local players is indispensable in the planning and the implementation of strategic and critical objectives related to those three pillars. Local ownership greatly increases the chance of success of those initiatives.

Fourth, flexible, adequate and timely funding that enables rapid reaction and sustained support for programmes is necessary to ensure that early challenges are addressed immediately and that medium- to longer-term concerns are properly covered.

Lastly, local capacity-building must be an integral part of all responses. Attention to local capacity-building has positive implications for financing, particularly for relations with donors and aid agencies. Prioritization in the strengthening of local institutions encourages local actors to become involved in the design and the implementation of programmes. The net effect is shared decision-making and accountability.

The role ahead for the Security Council in humanitarian crises is fraught with challenges and opportunities.

First, institutional innovation, along the lines of what the Secretary-General referred to, is needed with regard to how crises are handled. That will involve strengthening the coordination of humanitarian agencies in such areas as logistics and communications in order to ensure predictable, efficient and effective assistance.

Secondly, the Security Council should continue and enhance its support for regional organizations, because they contribute to the strengthening of the three pillars of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Thirdly, the Security Council could embark on targeted assistance for vulnerable groups such as refugees, internally displaced persons, child soldiers, ex-combatants and unemployed youths. Broad policy frameworks should be applied to specific projects such as infrastructure development.

Fourthly, the Security Council has an important part to play in making sure that the rule of law, the DDR process and security sector reform are tackled in an integrated manner in order to establish and enhance their relevance to each other and to the overall goal.

Fifthly, in drawing up the mandates of peacekeeping missions, the Council should, in its resolutions, carefully provide very clear objectives and tasks for achieving goals in those three areas, individually and in relation to one another.

The Security Council has recognized the link between security and human rights. The peacekeeping mandates for El Salvador, Cambodia, Angola, Liberia and Georgia included a human rights component, and the protection of civilians has been enshrined in resolution 1296 (2000), among others.

The challenge for the Security Council and the international community as a whole is to free some current responses and assistance to humanitarian crises that arise out of armed conflicts from what one author

calls "political evangelism". There is a more ideal role for the Council, to which the Secretary-General referred: to prevent the onset of humanitarian crises. That will require attention to the root causes of conflict. The proposed Peacebuilding Commission could very well strengthen the Council's ability to approach humanitarian crises within the larger framework of peacebuilding efforts.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Fiji.

Mr. Savua (Fiji): Allow me to congratulate your delegation, Mr. Minister, on its assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. We also thank your delegation for the document distributed to guide today's debate.

The leadership and monitoring role of the Security Council in all humanitarian crises cannot be overemphasized. In order to assist it in administering and controlling operations, the Council must be supported by accurate, up-to-the-minute information and an intelligence unit and allied network.

Good intelligence and information and a broad-based information database should provide the Council with contingency plans to cover all manner of scenarios, ease the decision-making process and provide a forecast of likely global conflagration points. They should enable the Council to prepare plans including estimated budgetary requirements and to estimate when the exercise of the right to protect is justified.

The training of the police and the military of the emerging State should be expedited as a matter of priority, but not at the expense of the impoverished majority by training the very same domineering security personnel who had hounded them previously. Proper selection, combined with a good understanding of the background of the problems, is essential in conducting a good training programme.

While best practices and lessons learned ought to provide a decent basis for preparing training syllabuses, local demands and practices must also be factored in to ensure ownership and avoid creating an institution that reflects another nation's doctrinal teachings. The credibility of the United Nations has to be resurrected, and troop-contributing countries must deploy highly disciplined and well-trained troops so that best practices of the recent past in that regard can be corrected and improved.

Fiji agrees that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) process should be nationally owned. Nations must decide on the extent of reconciliation, the time limit for prosecuting crimes and who should be reintegrated. Where possible, there should be a parallel, two-pronged approach giving equal priority to the DDR process and the handling of refugees. National ownership of the process should be underlined, and when national ownership is instituted it must be respected. Outside interventions must be accompanied by an understanding of the rationale that led to the decision. Nations, however, must accept all the strengths and the shortcomings of their decisions.

We strongly support the involvement of regional organizations and neighbouring countries in the peace process. Support by international and local actors and consistency in the flow of donor aid must be insisted upon at the outset. We have such operations in the South Pacific: the United Nations-sponsored peacekeeping operation in Bougainville, which has been successfully concluded, and the Regional Assistance Mission in the Solomon Islands (RAMSI). While full United Nations support is still forthcoming for RAMSI, we ask that modalities be found to allow donor aid to arrive within a consistent and sustainable manner.

RAMSI is continuing to play a role in the peacebuilding process in the Solomon Islands. Its mission now is to build long-lasting peace and to prevent further outbreaks or the escalation of violence. We would like to know how long a mandate a mission would require for long-lasting peace to be achieved and guaranteed. We cannot provide an answer for the moment. Perhaps when the United Nations and the South Pacific finally come to work together, we will find that RAMSI, although small, may contain the prescription that can provide the answers.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mrs. Juul (Norway): Norway shares the views expressed in the statement to be made on behalf of the European Union (EU) and others. I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Council to one of the important issues referred to in that statement concerning the Security Council's role in humanitarian crises, namely humanitarian space in integrated missions.

In his report to the Economic and Social Council last year, the Secretary-General referred to the

shrinking space of humanitarian action and pointed out the need to review and establish clearer guidance on civil-military cooperation and coordination. Since that has a particular bearing on United Nations integrated missions, Norway decided to co-finance a study by independent experts, which was followed by a well-attended conference on integrated missions that took place in Oslo at the end of May. We have great expectations that the United Nations will benefit from the existing momentum and develop practical solutions to the opportunities and dilemmas that integrated missions present. The Security Council should be active in this respect.

On the humanitarian side, there is still some reluctance with regard to integrated missions because of humanitarian space concerns and a feeling that integration has too often been synonymous with subordination. This perception is particularly strong in non-United Nations humanitarian organizations, but it is present in United Nations humanitarian bodies as well. The role of the humanitarian coordination structures in relation to the mission is a major issue. While strong integration may increase cohesion within the United Nations, it risks undermining the United Nations position on wider humanitarian coordination, as has been the case in Liberia. There seems to be growing awareness that the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs should be located outside the mission structure in situations of high tension or active conflict.

One should not aim for a blueprint model for all missions. The concept of integration gives a sense of direction, but no clear organizational solutions. As each field operation must meet different challenges, mission mandates, planning and design must also be flexible. As the integrated missions study found, form should follow function. Key factors for success are continuity and complementarity between different parts of a United Nations operation and relevant external actors. This must be built in from the early stages of planning and be reflected in the mandates of the missions. In particular, transition and development issues should also be included from the very beginning of the planning process.

Thus, the planning processes of an integrated mission should be as inclusive as possible from the start, and the field level should be involved. The needs and expectations of the local population must be taken into account in all phases. Moreover, coherent planning requires coherent financing. It is crucial that funding be made available for all mission components at the same time. From our point of view, it is logical that all activities included in the mission's mandate should be financed by assessed contributions. The urgent need for better financing of humanitarian action is evident.

In closing, I would like to add my voice to those, like the EU, that have welcomed the introduction of regular briefings to the Security Council by the Emergency Relief Coordinator. The humanitarian dimension is essential if the Council is to ensure a coherent and effective United Nations crisis response that takes fully into account the impact of its action or inaction on individual human beings in conflict areas. Humanitarian issues must therefore continue to be an integral part of the Security Council's agenda.

Mr. Zhang Yishan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation is pleased to welcome you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, to the Council to preside over today's debate. We would like to express appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, for his statement, as well as to the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Guéhenno, for his briefing.

The concept of humanitarian crises is a broad one. The Security Council, as the organ of the United Nations bearing the primary responsibility for international peace and security, should, as a matter of course, play a lead role in conflict prevention and management. Effective conflict prevention and resolution, as well as post-conflict reconstruction, are the primary functions of the Security Council in response to humanitarian crises. In its future undertakings, the Council should attach greater importance to the question of how to help conflict areas maintain stability and how to get them back on track towards sustained development so as to prevent relapses into conflict.

In this context, I would like to raise a number of issues.

First, the rule of law and justice in law enforcement are necessary prerequisites for a peaceful transition. They are also a fundamental guarantee for the consolidation of lasting peace. In areas emerging from conflict, ensuring the rule of law and justice should become an integral part of the overall effort to achieve peace and stability, protecting the fundamental interests of local populations and serving the overall interests of social stability. All the participants in post-

conflict reconstruction efforts should abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter and universally recognized norms of international law, and should respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries concerned. Only in that way can the relevant efforts be considered justified, win the credibility and trust of the recipient countries and genuinely promote post-conflict peacebuilding.

Secondly, most humanitarian crises take place in less-developed areas and are closely linked with poverty and underdevelopment. In such areas, the end of a conflict does not necessarily mean the arrival of peace. Usually we are faced with grave challenges in terms of finance, technology and lack of human resources. The United Nations should mobilize timely international resources and provide technical assistance, playing a greater role in that respect, in order to help the countries concerned to implement their disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and intensify their efforts to strengthen the justice sector.

In providing assistance to the countries concerned, the international community, in particular the donor community should fully respect local history, cultural traditions and legal structures, respect the ownership and decision-making capacity of local populations and avoid becoming involved in internal conflicts. Instead of issuing orders, it should provide guidance in keeping with the realities and needs on the ground. The focus should be on building the capacity of local areas and populations rather than on imposing a predetermined model of governance.

Thirdly, in responding to humanitarian crises, the Security Council should strengthen coordination and cooperation with the affected regions and subregions to help enhance their capacity to deal with such crises. The African continent should not only be the focus of United Nations conflict prevention activities; it should also be the focus of the Organization's post-conflict peacebuilding efforts.

The Security Council should not only help the African countries concerned with post-conflict peacebuilding; in keeping with the realities and specific needs on the ground, it should also strengthen the continent's regional and subregional organizations by providing them with logistical, financial and technological assistance in order to improve their overall capacity for post-conflict peacebuilding.

China supports the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission, which we hope will become functional as soon as possible. We hope that that initiative will promote post-conflict peacebuilding efforts and foster lasting peace and stability. It should also have a direct impact on United Nations efforts to coordinate post-conflict peacebuilding activities. We hope that the parties concerned will reach agreement on the details of the initiative as soon as possible.

China endorses the presidential statement drafted by the Greek delegation. We are grateful to that delegation for its efforts.

Mr. Mahiga (United Republic of Tanzania): We join in expressing our gratitude to you, Mr. Minister, for chairing this important meeting, which seeks to enhance the manner in which the Security Council responds to humanitarian crises in the context of the maintenance of international peace and security. This is an area of particular interest to my country and to Africa. We are therefore greatly indebted to the Greek presidency for this focused initiative. A better understanding of humanitarian crises is an important element in preventing, responding to and resolving such crises.

The major challenge we have before us in preventing conflict and reducing the escalation of humanitarian crises is dealing with threats to peace and security. We need to acknowledge that such threats include not only international war and conflict, but also civil violence, organized crime, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, poverty, deadly infectious diseases and environmental degradation. Although we acknowledge that Member States have the primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security — including the obligation to address the root causes of violent conflict — the support of the entire international community and of the Security Council is very important.

The role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises should be based on the impact of such crises on international peace and security. It should be seen in three interrelated phases — the evolution of such crises, the response to them and their resolution — as part of the Council's moral and political responsibility. However, humanitarian action alone should not be a substitute for needed political action.

The Security Council should be knowledgeable about and concerned by early signs of the multiple root

causes of humanitarian crises, both man-made and caused by natural disasters. Such knowledge would enable the Council to initiate early action to prevent or contain the outbreak of full-scale conflict. Poverty and hunger, combined with deteriorating environmental factors, can cause or exacerbate conflict. Among the range of options that should be available to the Security Council and to the international community as a whole are timely humanitarian action such as the provision of food and HIV/AIDS assistance to help concerned Governments help and protect their citizens. Poverty and hunger can lead to desperate acts such as violent crime and facilitate the recruitment of child soldiers.

Systematic patterns of gross human rights violations are indications of impending humanitarian and political crisis, leading to crimes against humanity, violations of international humanitarian law and genocide. The Security Council, in collaboration with the relevant United Nations bodies and civil society organizations, ought to respond in a timely manner to human rights violations and take appropriate collective action in accordance with its mandate set out in Chapters VI and VII of the Charter.

Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security is very relevant in that regard. The role of civil society and national and regional institutions in preventing and resolving conflicts is critical. Those groups have information obtained on the ground and can be good advisers with regard to action, since they are familiar with the territories and situations concerned. Their involvement promotes ownership of the peace process for the attainment of lasting peace and sustainable development in the affected countries and regions.

It has now become standard practice, following the onset of crises and the establishment of peace, to set up integrated peacekeeping missions whose duties include providing humanitarian assistance and protecting civilians. It should be remembered that, before the implementation of peace operations, victims of displacement such as internally displaced persons and refugees not only need humanitarian assistance, but can also be victims and sources of destabilization in countries experiencing such stressful situations. Moreover, they can complicate peaceful negotiations and relations between and among neighbouring States. Providing international protection and assistance to such groups should be a shared responsibility, and solutions to such problems should be built into subsequent peace agreements. The Security Council should remain seized of such problems, as they have direct relevance to regional and international peace and security.

As a State in the Great Lakes region of Africa, Tanzania knows only too well how humanitarian crises triggered by conflicts in other countries can affect a country's development. The refugee burden we bear is one whose solution lies only in peace and security in the region. That pursuit is at the heart of the Dar es Salaam Declaration of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, which focuses on peace and security, democracy and good governance, economic development and regional integration, and social and economic issues. Progress and success on all those fronts will require not only the resolve of our own countries, but also the support of the international community and of the Security Council in the context of its mandate in collaboration with regional organizations. However, regional capacities will need to be evaluated and, where necessary, bolstered.

The immediate post-conflict phase and the transition from peacekeeping and relief to development can have destabilizing tendencies if they are not properly addressed and managed. The return and reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, the disarmament and demobilization of combatants and the issues of transitional justice, governance, reconciliation and development should be comprehensively integrated into the transition.

The peacebuilding commission will have to deal precisely with those issues, which have not been addressed holistically before. The Security Council has a crucial role to play, in collaboration with other organs of the United Nations, such as the Economic and Social Council, funds and programmes, including the humanitarian agencies of the United Nations and the international community. During that period, humanitarian needs may actually be larger while food production and coping mechanisms are rebuilt and social services restored as part of the recovery effort.

There has to be a seamless transfer of responsibilities from the Security Council to other actors and stakeholders in shoring up a country emerging from conflict into sustainable peace and development. We need to ensure that there is adequate coordination within United Nations entities, as well as

with civil society, national Governments and regional organizations, as well as bilateral and multilateral agencies, in that partnership.

Last but not least, the protection of humanitarian personnel is an enduring challenge. Those persons often go into conflict situations way ahead of the peacekeepers. Without adequate protection, humanitarian personnel become victims of rebels and, in some cases, rebels target them for food, funds and vehicles. Their security should also be the concern of this Council.

Mr. Oshima (Japan): My delegation appreciates your presence, Sir, in the Security Council today to preside over this important debate. Your initiative to consider the Security Council's role in humanitarian crises, with a focus on security sector issues, is welcome. It is well-timed and thought-provoking.

In your note for this debate, you suggested three major issues — the rule of law, security sector reform, and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) — as requiring special attention in achieving sustainable peace in a post-conflict situation. We agree with your view. When a conflict triggers a serious humanitarian crisis, such as refugee flows and internal displacement, the first response called for from national and international actors is to provide protection and emergency humanitarian relief to the people affected. In a situation in which law and order have broken down, which is often the case in war situations, that becomes a difficult and often risky undertaking. We are aware and we salute the fact that many humanitarians do that job with extraordinary dedication and courage.

In the continuum from conflict to post-conflict situations, once a crisis is contained and peace achieved, the next response called for is taking the right measures to help consolidate the peace and, in so doing, preventing a return to conflict. If the rule of law is quickly re-established in a post-conflict society in the reconstruction phase, the risk of a return to conflict will be much reduced. Therefore, where United Nations peace operations are deployed, it is important to ensure that the rule of law and other security-related perspectives be adequately incorporated into the mission's mandate.

In establishing the rule of law under United Nations peace operations, security sector reform, encompassing a wide range of State and local public security institutions and organizations, becomes an important task. Those agencies may include the military, the police, the judiciary, the penal system and other public administrative bodies in charge of security. Often, such reform becomes a highly sensitive undertaking in terms of traditions, values and objectives. In such circumstances, the role which a United Nations peace operation is capable of playing and should play in security sector reform must be most carefully considered in the formulation of its mandate.

We believe that the United Nations role in security sector reform should be tailored to a given specific situation and discussed on a case-by-case basis. For example, the United Nations has been reluctant to get involved in the area of military assistance, and in our view rightly so, leaving that aspect to bilateral arrangements. Some have argued, however, that the United Nations should play a certain role in military reform, in view of security sector reform's relation to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and the important role played by national armies in the security sector. That issue requires further discussion.

In considering security sector reform, it is also important to recognize the fact that significant contributions are often made through bilateral assistance and by the United Nations and other international organizations, such as the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank. In those situations, the role of the Secretary-General's special representative should be enhanced to ensure the overall effective coordination of efforts in a manner that respects those contributions as well.

The rule of law and security sector reform are closely related to DDR. One of the challenges for DDR is to disarm illegal armed groups and to eliminate the security threats posed by them. From our own experience of playing a leading role in DDR in Afghanistan, we believe that the critical part in the process lies in convincing military commanders that the peace process is irreversible and that there is no other way than to participate in the political process through elections. At the same time, combatants need to be assured that they will be protected by law from unlawful or unfair retribution. In their reintegration into civilian life, former combatants should be legally protected against unfair treatment.

It is clear that those three aspects — the rule of law, security sector reform and DDR — are closely interlinked and pose major challenges to United Nations peace

operations. In the planning of a United Nations peace operation, therefore, adequate consideration must be given to the United Nations role in providing appropriate assistance in those three areas and their relationship to other components, such as post-conflict reconstruction and development. When the proposed peacebuilding commission is established, it is expected that those issues, among others, will be fully and productively discussed.

The successful implementation of security assistance for the rule of law, security sector reform and DDR requires the deployment of a broad range of civilian experts, including judges, prosecutors and lawyers, as well as civilian police and military advisers. For civilian police and military advisers, the United Nations has been developing a system for quick deployment, largely following recommendations in the Brahimi report. That is to be commended.

On the other hand, the timely deployment of legal and other civilian experts remains somewhat problematic, due in part to difficulties in finding qualified experts and in part to the time-consuming recruitment process now in place. We understand that, in order to improve the process, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations has been promoting a roster system, and we urge that it be fully developed. At the same time, we wish to request the Secretariat to further improve the recruitment process so as to facilitate the timely appointment and deployment of qualified individuals. We suggest that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations consider, among other options, the possibility of recruiting and dispatching civilian experts, who would work closely with civilian police and the military, following the same formula as applied to the latter.

Finally, we wish to highlight one important piece of practical advice that you, Sir, have noted in the discussion paper, and that is the need to establish best practices.

Security concerns people's daily lives. In any consideration of security sector assistance, one must bear in mind the need to ensure that the local people do not feel that alien laws and systems are being imposed upon them. The United Nations should offer local leaders and people several options and allow them to select the most suitable. It is from that point of view that the United Nations should develop best practices, based on lessons learned through the various activities it has conducted to date.

In concluding, let me assure the Council that Japan will continue its active cooperation in the three key pillar areas, including assistance in training and the dispatching of qualified experts.

The President: I call on the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Rastam (Malaysia): I wish to congratulate you and your Government, Mr. Minister, on Greece's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I should also like to thank your delegation for taking the initiative to consider the role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises, which is indeed an important issue of concern to all. We appreciate the fact that that is being done in an open debate of the Council and with the participation of the larger membership of the United Nations. We also wish to pay tribute to last month's French presidency of the Council.

My delegation is fully cognizant of the efforts made by the United Nations to improve its system and to respond effectively to the challenges posed by violent humanitarian crises. While there have been many successes, there have also been a number of failures, when peace agreements collapsed before they could be fully implemented and States relapsed into conflict soon after. In many instances, conflict and violence create humanitarian crises. How the United Nations, including the Security Council, responds to such crises remains a major concern. That merits further discussion and investigation, to better understand the issues before the Council today.

The Charter of the United Nations confers upon the Security Council, acting on behalf of Member States, the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. That includes actions by the Council with regard to issues relating to humanitarian crises where clear violations of international law, international humanitarian law or human rights have occurred in conflict situations that threaten regional or international peace and security.

My delegation views any action that is aimed at humanitarian intervention per se as having no basis in the Charter and international law. It should therefore be clear that while the Security Council has a role to play, its response should be based on a distinction between crises arising out of conflict situations and those that result from other causes, including natural disasters. While action to deal with conflict is laudable, it also

remains the Council's responsibility to ensure that conflict is avoided. There is therefore definitely a need to learn from past experience and to continue to find ways and means to avert conflict. Today's debate points us in the right direction.

We recognize that the Council has the responsibility to address humanitarian issues relating to situations of conflict, and that it has taken appropriate action to deal with such situations. The Council's consideration of those issues has laid the groundwork for actions in the areas of peacekeeping and peacebuilding and in preventing a return to conflict. We agree that a return to conflict often hinges upon the extent to which three key issues in post-conflict situations are, or are not, adequately addressed, namely, the promotion of the rule of law, security-sector reform and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) of ex-combatants. My delegation supports the view that those pillars for post-conflict security should be further strengthened in order to achieve long-lasting peace.

In fact, during its Council presidency in July 1999, Malaysia initiated an open debate on the question of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (see S/PV.4020). We continue to believe that DDR remains an important aspect of peacebuilding as well as of overall efforts to avoid relapsing into conflict. It will be necessary to further develop that aspect, together with the promotion of the rule of law and security-sector reform, to ensure that some common or unified standards are established and to make certain that they are implementable. We welcome the adoption of best practices arising from past experiences in United Nations missions mandated by the Security Council.

Malaysia has been supportive of actions taken by the Security Council in averting humanitarian disasters arising from conflict situations. We also support efforts to deal with the culture of impunity so prevalent in conflict situations. We recognize that it is important for the Council to act in certain instances to ensure safe and unimpeded access for humanitarian assistance, as well as the safety, security and freedom of movement of United Nations and other humanitarian workers. Early action could be required in some cases. However, the Council must act upon credible, reliable and verifiable information to ensure that the right decisions are made and that the right action is taken in conformity with the Charter and international law and are guided by the principle of respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States.

It goes without saying that there is a need for the Secretariat to enhance its early-warning capability. The Secretariat should have adequate means to gather credible, reliable and verifiable information and to make appropriate assessments for the benefit of the Security Council and all Member States. To a certain extent, Member States with the capability to do so can assist the Secretariat through the regular sharing of vital information pertaining to threats to peace and security. The Secretariat should also continue to maintain and update a compendium of information on all aspects related to this question for the use of Council members and Member States at large.

The role played by the Security Council can certainly be augmented by debate, dialogue and discussion in the other principal organs of the United Nations, namely, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. That is all the more pertinent with the recognition of the interconnectedness of threats and challenges faced by the international community and the need to face them in an integrated fashion, taking into account the linkages among development, peace and security and human rights. We look forward to further discussion on that and other issues in all United Nations bodies.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Mr. Toro Jiménez (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to invoke the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations. Its authors spoke not just of States and nations, but of "We the peoples of the United Nations". Let us therefore heed the voice of the socio-political actor who, after centuries of colonial oppression, is the main protagonist of modern history, having founded the United Nations. It should therefore be underscored that the States of the United Nations are simply mandated representatives vested with a renewable power granted by their respective sovereign peoples. Our primary duty is to respect that mandate and to exercise it faithfully while also respecting its most basic aspect: respect for self-determination, which is the foundation of this intergovernmental Organization.

Let us consider the actions of the Security Council in so-called humanitarian crises, dealt with initially

through peacekeeping operations which then — often without any resolution of the issue of continuity — are as if by magic transformed into peacebuilding operations. Let us begin by making a conceptual distinction between peacekeeping operations and the most recent peacebuilding operations. The former have the specific and limited objective of ending an internal conflict in a given State. Based on the premise that a civil war has ended, the latter have the objective of rebuilding a country devastated by war once peace had been re-established in order to prevent further conflict and to lay the foundations for a country's future development. To allow or encourage any confusion between those two types of operations produces irreconcilable contradictions between different objectives that cannot be resolved through either a single mandate or through successive or renewed mandates entrusted to the same persons. That can also have serious consequences for the affected States.

Peacekeeping operations imply the use of repression by the United Nations once peaceful means to end a conflict have been exhausted. That is the responsibility of the Security Council and, on a subsidiary basis, of the General Assembly. Peacebuilding operations, however, are exclusively the responsibility of the people of the country afflicted by conflict. The United Nations is obliged to respect the self-determination of peoples; its sole task is to support the process through international cooperation and on the basis of the parameters, norms and principles freely established by the people concerned. Doing otherwise would be to disregard the right of peoples to decide upon their own destiny. In contrast, in its peacebuilding operations, the Security Council has repeatedly disregarded the principle of the self-determination of peoples as well as the specific powers of the General Assembly with regard to international cooperation in this regard. Through that recurring practice, an attempt is being made to twist the interpretation of the Charter to legitimize the Council's usurpation of powers, thus securing its interference in the internal affairs of a State for unspeakable ends, taking advantage of the weakness and the helplessness of its people afflicted by war. In addition, it is an attempt to have the General Assembly's recognition of that practice form a key part of the proposed reform of the United Nations.

Attempts to justify that unjustifiable interference by the Security Council employ two different scenarios. The first is that of a State considered to have collapsed or failed as a result of a destructive, violent conflict, or a State that, although it has not suffered a civil war, is considered to be an unfeasible model of government for its people. The other scenario relates to a State whose Government, in the exercise of its legally established authority, is nevertheless judged to have committed massive violations of human rights against its population or significant sectors of that population.

The two scenarios share an deliberate absence of an historical perspective and implicitly condemn the population as the cause of its own degradation, conflict, poverty and neglect while discounting the factors that led to the outbreak of the armed conflict. If we examine the historical causes of the internal crises of African countries, we shall see that the internal conflicts that led to peacekeeping operations are entirely due to the persistence of a regime of oppression and plunder established by an imperialist power omnipresent in the country.

With respect to Haiti, the people's situation of extreme poverty and distress does not reflect the most incredible feat and revolutionary model of 1804, when the country made a qualitative political leap as a republic of slaves in a hegemonic world of monarchies claiming divine right. After suffering the opprobrium of colonial exploitation by France for centuries, Haiti fell prey to the United States from 1916 to 1934, masked as a protectorate. That was replaced by a similar regime, which is still in place, masked by a peacebuilding operation.

States that are free of all internal conflict can be chosen as recipients of peacebuilding operations, having been labelled as failed States. It should simply be noted that a plan is being prepared to destabilize selected Member States of the United Nations by provoking an internal crisis so great that it requires the multilateral cloak of a peacebuilding operation, a crisis with characteristics resembling the recent transformations in certain former Soviet Republics. There is an imperialist project under way, which intends to hijack sovereignty and self-determination. It is supported by an office in the United States State Department that possesses a list of 25 States not yet destabilized that can be targeted for immediate or future restructuring operations, with the agreement of the patrons of messianic fundamentalism in the Administration of President Bush.

The second scenario involves the predetermination that a massive violation of human rights has taken place in a country as a result of the Government's alleged systematic negligence or direct repression of the population. In that case, the peacekeeping operation is justified on the basis of the doctrine of the responsibility to protect, which is rooted in the belief that the international community — a euphemism by which the great Powers define themselves — has the fundamental right to intervene in any Member State of the United Nations, by decision of the Security Council, in a false rescue operation on behalf of the people supposedly afflicted by State repression, and to impose sanctions on the State and Government if they fail to assume their obligation to do so themselves. In the inventory of States threatened by this intervention mechanism are all the States of the South, which are an annoyance for the empire.

It is clear that no such fundamental right exists; it has no basis in the Charter of the United Nations or international law. Nor does the so-called implied representation that the international community attributes to the Security Council exist. That blatant manipulation directly jeopardizes the very foundations of international society and peoples' right to freedom and to take their leading role as the founders of the United Nations.

Mr. Dumitru (Romania): Mr. Minister, my delegation feels honoured by your presence at the helm of the Security Council. I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on arranging a discussion on a theme that will allow for the productive consideration of ways to improve the role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises. It is very timely.

Romania associates itself with the statement to be made shortly by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Sir Emyr Jones Parry, on behalf of the European Union. Consequently, I will speak more briefly.

Over the past two years, the Security Council has reflected on various dimensions of conflict management and post-conflict peacebuilding; those reflections have made an effective contribution to our collective thinking on developing a coherent and effective response to those challenges. Today's discussion complements that ongoing process, and the non-paper recently circulated by Ambassador Vassilakis (S/2005/434, annex) has greatly helped to guide the Council in that direction. Romania fully endorses the main thrust of the concept paper proposed by the presidency, namely, the need for a holistic vision and approach.

Indeed, in the discharge of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council is frequently called upon to intervene in complex crisis situations. Those situations are often characterized by interlinked military and security dimensions, as well as by political, economic, social and humanitarian aspects. The wide range of issues involved requires a comprehensive, multidimensional approach based on increased system-wide coordination.

Against that backdrop, the time has come for the Security Council to approach the host of tasks, including the rule of law and security-sector reform, that condition the success of peacebuilding, not as separate dimensions with individual merits but as congruent and closely integrated elements. In this sphere, the synergetic approach is not an end in itself but a way to make a practical impact on one of the major components of the work of the United Nations: the effort to protect human life.

In that context, we should acknowledge and give due consideration to all ways in which the Security Council can contribute to better, more effective action by the international community in the face of humanitarian crises provoked by conflicts. The Council's role is decisive and wide in scope.

In that context, I would like to share shed some light on four aspects of this issue. First, Romania considers that the logic of prevention should be given the highest priority, particularly in situations where there is a threat of a breakdown in peace and security, which could have disastrous consequences for civilians. In that regard, it is our view that all conflict situations, irrespective of their type or stage, must be closely monitored by various United Nations bodies, in particular the Security Council, and that the system should be maintained at an appropriate level of readiness to act whenever a dispute appears to escalate, threatening to cause a humanitarian disaster.

In that framework, Romania believes that due attention should be also given to forgotten crises and so-called frozen conflicts, which have the greatest potential to evolve towards violent forms of confrontation. Most frozen conflicts tend to generate

lawless zones characterized by massive and systematic human rights abuses and therefore a breeding ground for humanitarian crises.

The United Nations should not refrain from deploying the whole range of its tools to address that type of situation as well, keeping in mind that, in the event that a Government is unable to provide for the security of its own people, the international community has the legitimate right to intervene and protect the victims.

Secondly, before taking action, there is a need to collect, organize and analyse properly all the necessary information about the potential sources of humanitarian crises. United Nations agencies can and must play a crucial role in this respect. We appreciate very much the work done by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, and we are especially pleased that the Council has been able to learn, on a regular basis from the Secretariat's briefings, about developments on the ground. However, information provided by specific monitoring and reporting mechanisms at the disposal of the Security Council, such as that proposed for situations in which children are affected by armed conflict, is, in our view, indispensable when the time comes to decide on the right course of action to prevent or stop a humanitarian crisis.

Thirdly, the Security Council must bring to bear its political weight to make sure that those responsible for humanitarian crises are brought to justice. Support for the International Criminal Court as an effective instrument in the efforts of the international community to put an end to impunity in cases of war crimes or massive and systematic human rights abuse is essential.

Finally, with regard to coherent thinking and action, we should keep in mind the interlinkage between the Security Council and other major actors. In this regard, in the Council and elsewhere, Romania has constantly promoted cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations. Enhanced cooperation and, where appropriate, coordination and consultation with regional organizations, are particularly important, including for an increased and more effective role for the Security Council in humanitarian crises. That should be accomplished on the basis of a more integrated approach, with the aim of maximizing the use of available resources and capabilities, which, if taken in isolation, will always seem scarce but, if considered jointly, may prove to be more than adequate.

Romania remains committed to transforming this particular challenge into a solid lesson learned on the way towards strengthening the role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises.

Mr. Fendrick (United States of America): We would like to thank you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, for having organized this important debate. We would also like to congratulate Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, for his contributions to this discussion.

This is a timely discussion. It is especially relevant to the wide-ranging discussions that are taking place in these halls concerning United Nations reform. Today's subject really involves the United Nations institutional gap identified by the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. As the Panel noted in paragraph 261 of its report (A/59/565),

> "there is no place in the United Nations system explicitly designed to avoid State collapse and the slide to war or to assist countries in their transition from war to peace."

The High-level Panel wanted to help the international community to address the spectrum of problems that many States confront today, from pre-conflict, through conflict itself to post-conflict or recovery.

The international community has often had to play a role across that continuum, and properly so. For most of the history of the United Nations, conflicts have almost invariably wound up threatening regional, if not global, peace and security, whatever their causes. Whether conflict begins as internal strife or as a localized cross-border affair, the wider international community frequently becomes engaged. It is therefore entirely appropriate for the Security Council to consider lessons learned from helping societies emerge from conflict.

In the light of that history, the High-level Panel's recommendation that the Security Council establish a Peacebuilding Commission makes eminent sense. The Council should act on that recommendation promptly. No one foresees the day when the international community will be out of the business of helping post-

conflict societies. Therefore, we owe it to ourselves to try to learn from experience and apply the lessons to conflict prevention.

In our view, a stable society with a successful economy is necessarily rooted in the rule of law and has representative institutions that operate predictably, according to law. The economy is also framed and governed by law. As a society heads over the cliff into conflict, the rule of law breaks or is weakened. In recent cases, hostilities often have eroded respect for the most basic norms, including those set forth in international humanitarian law. Afterwards, confidence in the rule of law must be rebuilt if a society is to avoid slipping backwards.

Almost all of us have experience with these issues. As a community, we have struggled with the full array of problems in trying to help societies emerge from armed conflict and stay away from it in the future. We know that security is a sine qua non for peace, justice and prosperity. To build or rebuild security takes great effort, and security institutions must be tied into the overall programme of social reconstruction. Thus, training is indispensable — but training not only in conflict management or control, but also in support of the rule of law. No one wants the effort to result in the formation of a praetorian guard. Therefore, creating appropriate security structures must be part of a larger whole: it involves training police and reforming criminal justice institutions — courts, prosecutorial offices and prisons.

Where the United Nations as an institution is concerned, the work on security must be coordinated with all the other efforts being undertaken in connection with a particular society; and all the other efforts must be coordinated with each other. That is a great lesson that the United Nations as an institution should take from its recent experience with complex peacekeeping operations in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. The United States believes that the Peacebuilding Commission under discussion can and should make a significant contribution in that area.

Better coordination among United Nations family entities and with donors, international financial institutions and regional partners, as well as taking on board the lessons from the complex United Nations peacekeeping and peace support missions of the last 15 years, can help us all do a better job of conflict prevention. In the event that conflict cannot be avoided, such coordination and application of lessons learned can improve our collective efforts to assist States to recover from conflict. These activities are central to the successful discharge of the Security Council's primary responsibility for peace and security.

Mr. Aho-Glele (Benin) (*spoke in French*): I would like join with all those speakers who have thanked you personally, Mr. Minister, and your delegation, for having taken the initiative to hold this debate.

There has been encouraging progress in the search for solutions to humanitarian problems, with renewed interest in such matters in recent years in the United Nations, in particular the Security Council. We welcome the innovations introduced into the mandates of peacekeeping operations following the publication of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809).

While welcoming such progress, we are all aware of the challenges that remain. In this regard, I would like to elaborate on four basic points. The first relates to strengthening the authority of international humanitarian law. The second relates to ensuring safe and unhindered access for humanitarian assistance for victims and affected populations. The third relates to the need to deal with humanitarian crises in a timely manner. The fourth relates to the need to promote political solutions to the conflicts that lead to humanitarian crises.

On the first point, Benin would like to point out that respect in all circumstances for international humanitarian law is indispensable for the prevention of humanitarian crises. The Security Council should at all times reaffirm that key principle and use all its authority and the instruments available to it to prevent the massive violations of humanitarian law that affect civilian populations, in particular, children, women and the elderly, and to put an immediate stop to them whenever they occur.

It goes without saying that children in armed conflict are also affected by the consequences of humanitarian crises. Benin hopes that the Council will very soon be able to take a decision regarding a draft resolution on this issue. Its adoption would undoubtedly help to promote respect for existing international norms in this area, to put an end to the inhumane treatment inflicted on children in armed conflict.

It is particularly important that violations of humanitarian law not go unpunished. The principle of rejecting amnesty for grave crimes should become an essential standard for Council action. The Secretary-General's proposal concerning the sending of fact-finding missions to countries where such violations occur remains important here. The issue of strengthening national judicial systems is also of primary importance in that regard. In fact, the adoption of a preventive approach to humanitarian crises requires that high priority be given to re-establishing the rule of law and to national reconciliation in countries at risk or emerging from armed conflict, because the rule of law offers a favourable context for the effective protection of civilian populations.

It is the duty of the Security Council to do everything in its power to guarantee respect for the principle of ensuring that victims and all affected populations have safe and unhindered access to humanitarian assistance. Administrative impediments and the harassment of humanitarian personnel must be prohibited, because they are entirely unjustifiable. The parties involved must cooperate constructively in humanitarian action and must shoulder their responsibility to ensure the safety and freedom of movement of humanitarian personnel. Humanitarian action must be conducted with strict respect for the principles of neutrality and impartiality.

Problems of access due to difficult terrain are a real challenge for the international community. It must mobilize all the appropriate logistical means it requires to reach populations in distress, wherever they are.

With regard to my third point — the need to address humanitarian crises in a timely manner — we must emphasize that the differences of views within the Security Council on assessing situations and on choosing means of action undermine the Council's credibility, because they promote the worsening of critical humanitarian situations and are often exploited by the parties to continue and even increase the suffering they inflict on populations.

That said, there are some examples in which the Council has shown remarkable effectiveness. Among those successes, I would mention the dispatch of Operation Artemis to Ituri, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the deployment of a multinational force to Haiti in February 2004. The most important lesson to be drawn from those two cases is that effective Security Council action was possible because of the Council's ability to promptly take a unanimous decision, guided by its concern to fully shoulder its responsibility towards the threatened populations.

Finally, the fourth point — very important in the view of my delegation — relates to the need to promote the political settlement of the conflicts from which humanitarian crises result. Benin wishes to point out that the Council has a major responsibility in that area. It must equip itself with the means to closely follow and promote negotiations among the parties.

Furthermore, it is important to continue and conclude, as soon as possible, the discussions now under way on providing the Security Council with an early-warning mechanism that would operate in close cooperation with regional organizations. The Council would thus have information and proposals for concrete action enabling it to take swift, timely and useful decisions on situations that could compromise international peace and security and gravely affect the situation of civilian populations.

Cooperation with regional organizations is a tool that the Council should use to the utmost to increase its capacity to act preventively or to react promptly in the face of humanitarian crises. Providing sufficient support to regional and subregional organizations to strengthen their capacities for rapid intervention is of paramount importance for such cooperation, without prejudice to the Council's prerogatives and primary responsibility in the area of the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mobilizing adequate financing and taking into account the regional dimension related to the cross-border mobility of ex-combatants will greatly help to stem the resurgence of armed conflicts and the disastrous humanitarian situations resulting from them. That is the prerequisite for ensuring the success of recovery plans in countries emerging from conflict. Here, the inherent link between security and development is clear. Strengthening local capacities to maintain public order and safety — not only with resources, but also with properly trained personnel — must be an essential aspect of strategies for the withdrawal of United Nations peacekeeping operations from the countries where they are deployed.

The President: I now call on the representative of Indonesia.

Mrs. Asmady (Indonesia): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your country's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and by thanking you for convening this special debate on the role of the Security Council in humanitarian crises. In that respect, my delegation would also like to acknowledge the concept paper prepared for this discussion by the Permanent Mission of Greece (S/2005/434, annex).

My delegation would like to state that beyond the Security Council and its immediate purview of the maintenance of peace and security is the wider challenge of confronting the roots of conflict, which often lie in the area of development, or the lack of it. It is now common knowledge that development and security must be pursued together if any progress is to be made in the multilateral context of the United Nations. Therefore, the lessons that the Security Council has learned in managing the post-conflict environment ought to include the need for the Council to work coherently with other United Nations organs and to utilize channels of development to discourage conflicts.

Having said that, let me also state that issues related to conflicts, humanitarian crises and post-conflict situations have been a focus of the Security Council's attention for many years. The Council has sometimes responded to such situations by establishing peacekeeping missions. The variety and complexity of United Nations peacekeeping responsibilities in the 1990s provided ample opportunities for reflection and reassessment with regard to various aspects of the Organization's humanitarian work.

Therefore, it is proper that the Council has decided at this time to undertake a review of its role concerning this important issue. My delegation shares the view that, in addition to development, conflict prevention depends on the extent to which the issues of the rule of law, security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) are adequately and properly addressed.

Democracy means nothing if it is not well grounded on the rule of law. In the post-conflict phase, it is thus of the utmost importance that promoting the rule of law be made a matter of priority. That principle should apply to promoting respect for and establishing law and order in all its aspects. The lessons learned in many post-conflict situations in recent times may be put to good use here.

It is also important, in the rebuilding of justice and the rule of law in a society in transition, that adequate recognition be given to differences in national contexts. In this case, strategic planning should be based on national or local realities and not impose foreign models, as was clearly pointed out today by the Secretary-General in his opening statement.

In security sector reform, particularly in developing the capability of a national police force, international efforts must follow the important underlying fact that a police service supported by the national or local community is more capable of upholding law and order, as well as addressing insecurity that can have a far-reaching impact on economic, social and political developments. It is in that context that efforts to sustain peace in post-conflict situations should be based on a deep sense of ownership and focus on building the capacity of local actors. Indeed, it is only investment in local participation, ideas and energy that can imbue post-conflict efforts with the capacity to sustain peace not only through legitimacy, but through the deployment of "building tools" as well.

With reference to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes, my delegation is of the view that such programmes may well be placed in the broader context of the development agenda. Failure to curb the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons will contribute to sustaining criminal economic networks in post-conflict environments, thereby significantly minimizing and undermining the strategies and efforts to sustain peace.

DDR programmes, therefore, should always be a key component of peace processes. In view of the fact that former combatants cannot simply be dismissed and asked to return to normal life, since there is no normal life for them to return to, a well-structured programme based on lessons learned should be put into play, with adjustments for particular situations. In that regard, we must stress the need for timely, sustained and well-targeted resources at each stage of the peace process, including DDR programmes, the rule of law, and security sector reform. Although high levels of aid do not guarantee success, if they are inadequate, the effort might not be worthwhile in the first place.

Let me conclude by saying that Indonesia believes that, in providing support for the rebuilding of justice and the rule of law in a transitional society, the international community has a critical role to play in supporting conflict prevention as well as in post-conflict peacebuilding processes. However, such a role must be pursued in a supportive and facilitating manner, and not as a substitute for local efforts. Hence, we must be careful to avoid importing foreign models that may not be of any help to local situations.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Rock (Canada): Canada wishes to congratulate Greece on assuming the presidency and to express our thanks for this opportunity to take part in an open discussion on this important issue.

Canada firmly believes that the Security Council has a dual role in regard to humanitarian crises. It must not only respond quickly to such crises, but also, in the first instance, seek actively to prevent them.

Five years ago, the Secretary-General called for an urgent discussion of how we might reconcile the humanitarian imperatives of situations such as that in Rwanda with traditional definitions of sovereignty — a dilemma that continues to impede robust Security Council reactions in man-made humanitarian crises. Today, as we mark the tenth anniversary of the massacres at Srebrenica, we should reaffirm our collective will to move forward in improving the Council's ability to identify and to respond quickly to humanitarian crises.

In northern Uganda, civilians continue to bear the brunt of a brutal armed conflict — a conflict which the Council has yet to address. We believe that situations such as that cannot but benefit from the Council's sustained attention, and we again urge the Security Council to put the situation in northern Uganda on its agenda.

In our consideration of the Council's response to crises, it is also important to acknowledge that humanitarian crises are not solely the result of armed conflict. There are also those prompted by the misguided and malevolent policies of Governments towards their own populations. We call on the Council to take note of the latest humanitarian crisis being generated now in Zimbabwe. After inflicting hunger and economic ruin on its population, the policies of the Government of Zimbabwe are now creating a significant number of homeless. Canada believes that this situation deserves the full attention of the Council.

(*spoke in French*)

The necessary tools and powers for the international community to exercise its responsibility to protect civilian populations do not need to be reinvented — they are in the United Nations Charter. What is needed, however, is a framework to guide that immense responsibility.

The responsibility to protect provides such a framework. The Secretary-General endorsed that approach in his March report, calling on leaders to embrace the responsibility of States to protect their people and the subsidiary responsibility of the international community to act in extreme cases when a State is unable or unwilling to provide that protection.

(*spoke in English*)

A firm declaration of support for that emerging norm, made by leaders in September, will lay the normative groundwork for more effective responses by the Security Council. To ensure its effective implementation of that norm, we support the Secretary-General's recommendation that the Council adopt a resolution that includes guidelines for the use of force.

Hand in hand with the need to respond to conflict comes the obligation to bring an end to the culture of impunity that continues to dominate the majority of such situations. We cannot speak of human security or of protecting women and children when their abusers are allowed to go free.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) offers us the best hope for ending impunity, and we call on this Council to continue to exercise its authority under the Rome Statute to refer appropriate situations to the International Criminal Court as they arise. The Council's referral of the Darfur crisis to the ICC was an important and welcome step, but it must not remain the exception. Through cooperation between the Security Council and the parties to the Rome Statute, we can build a reliable and responsible system to bring the world's worst criminals to justice and to protect their victims.

The needs and challenges in rebuilding shattered societies in transition from war to peace are numerous and daunting. They include disarming, demobilizing

and reintegrating former combatants; ensuring a framework for transitional justice; providing security, including rebuilding the rule of law in all its aspects; re-constituting democratic governing structures and their legal foundations; rejuvenating a functioning economy; and guaranteeing the right of refugees and internally displaced persons to safely return to their homes. A coordinated response is essential.

In most cases, it is the United Nations that is called on to oversee that reconstruction process. The proposed peacebuilding commission will be critically important to enhance the capabilities of the United Nations, donor countries and regional organizations to meet the challenges posed by failed and fragile States. The situation in Haiti would be an excellent first case for such a commission to examine. The work of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Haiti of the Economic and Social Council and the recent joint mission of the Group and the Security Council to Haiti effectively illustrated the need to integrate development, security and institution-building in a mutually reinforcing way. The peacebuilding commission could carry that work further and we therefore fully support its establishment and implementation.

Canada's own approach to dealing with the conflict cycle is likewise evolving. We are working to establish a more coherent, whole-of-Government approach through a new Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force. It will address challenges across the conflict spectrum, from conflict prevention through to peace support and post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding.

I conclude by expressing the belief that much progress is being made in improving our ability to react to crises. The real challenge that remains today is not how we, the international community, can best deal with humanitarian crises once they have occurred, but how we can move more quickly and effectively to prevent them in the first place. We urge the Council to consider how best to enshrine that as a guiding principle in its actions.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry (United Kingdom): Your presence with us today, Mr. President, is very welcome, and it reflects the importance of the subject that we are debating.

I have the honour to speak in this debate on behalf of the European Union. The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate country Croatia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro, the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland and Liechtenstein, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, have all aligned themselves with this statement.

The good news for my colleagues is that I shall now summarize my prepared text, which will be circulated separately.

I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to discuss this important subject, and the Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General Guéhenno for their very pertinent remarks.

The Security Council is of course only one actor in the international response to humanitarian crises, so I would like to begin with some reflections on what contribution it can make.

First, the Council should have an important political role in conflict prevention and in dealing with the early stages of an emerging humanitarian crisis. The United Nations as a whole, and the Security Council in particular, should therefore be alert to signs of an imminent breakdown in international peace and security, in particular those situations that threaten widespread humanitarian consequences. The Council should be prepared from the earliest stage to make a leading contribution to international efforts to avert a descent into conflict and humanitarian suffering.

That means being prepared to give attention to new and neglected crises without waiting for the level of humanitarian suffering to rise to unacceptable levels. It means reminding Governments of their primary responsibility to assure the security, safety and humanitarian needs of their own people, and reminding them too that the international community has a legitimate interest if they are unable or unwilling to do that. In that regard, the European Union welcomes the debate on the important concept of the responsibility to protect.

Prevention is obviously better than having to pick up the pieces of broken lives and humanitarian suffering after conflict has broken out. We need to ensure that the Security Council is properly informed of possible threats, including through early warnings by the Secretary-General. One positive development in

that regard has been the introduction of regular briefings of the Council by Jan Egeland, the Humanitarian Coordinator. We should continue and extend that practice, including with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

The second key role for the Council is its primary responsibility to take action where international peace and security have broken down, where we must take full account of the humanitarian requirements of a crisis. It is not, of course, the Council's role to coordinate or direct humanitarian action, but it can do more to galvanize international humanitarian efforts and to lend political weight to them.

In considering our political response to a crisis, we should always give due priority to humanitarian considerations. The Council and its individual members should lend weight to efforts to ensure that political leaders on both sides of a conflict ensure access by humanitarian agencies to affected populations.

A major Security Council responsibility will be to establish multidimensional United Nations peace support operations that ensure that humanitarian considerations and activities are fully taken into account. In accordance with relevant Council resolutions, we also need to promote the role that peacekeepers play in protecting civilians, particularly with regard to vulnerable groups such as internally displaced persons, women and children.

The Council also has a role in ensuring that where humanitarian suffering is a result of deliberate human rights abuses or war crimes, those responsible are brought to justice. The European Union therefore strongly supports efforts to end impunity for such crimes, in particular through the effective functioning of the International Criminal Court.

But equally important is a third area of the Council's activity, namely, building the conditions for lasting peace and stability in order to prevent the recurrence of conflict and humanitarian suffering.

I would like to summarize three key areas of peacebuilding, namely, the rule of law, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) and security-sector reform.

First, strengthening the rule of law and good governance is essential to building societies that protect and improve the lives of all their citizens. The Secretary-General's excellent report on the subject last August (S/2004/616) and the subsequent Security Council discussion in October showed consensus on the need to treat the justice sector as a key element in building sustainable peace. An independent judiciary, humane and secure prisons and an effective and accountable police force are necessities. Without them, we risk anarchy and impunity; we undermine not only stability and security, but also democracy, the return of refugees and economic recovery.

But we have not yet done enough. The United Nations is still a long way from being able to effectively promote the rule of law and an end to impunity in the post-conflict situations in which it is engaged. For that reason, we welcome the Secretary-General's decision contained in his report entitled "In larger freedom" (A/59/2005) to create a Rule of Law Assistance Unit to deal specifically with post-conflict situations.

The second important area of peacebuilding that we need to improve is our approach to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration — DDR. We need to draw together past experience, both good and bad, and ensure that we understand what works and why it works. We therefore welcome the United Nations inter-agency process to develop guidelines on DDR. The challenge will be to implement those guidelines in a practical way that lifts our collective performance.

The third priority area, which is closely linked to the other two, is security-sector reform. Democratically controlled security services can be developed only in the context of establishing effective governance structures and the rule of law. DDR programmes can succeed only as part of a broader reform effort to deliver security services that guarantee, rather than threaten, the people they are meant to serve.

In all the three areas that I have described, the Security Council and the missions that it mandates are usually only one of a number of international players. Within the United Nations system, we must make sure that even as we create new capacities, we do not create new divisions. We must therefore ensure that we develop a coherent, overarching vision in the wider justice and security field, and that that is matched organizationally both at Headquarters and in the field.

That is why the European Union strongly supports the proposed establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission that would oversee the provisions of

coherent security, political, economic and other assistance to countries emerging from conflict, and advise on and promote comprehensive strategies for peacebuilding.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to thank you once again for organizing a debate on this important topic. We very much look forward to a future productive discussion in the Council on these issues, including as they pertain to specific country circumstances. And we warmly welcome the proposed presidential statement.

Mr. De La Sablière (France) (*spoke in French*): Today's debate — which we are pleased to be holding under your presidency, Mr. Minister — provides us with an opportunity to take a useful snapshot of the situation and to consider the Security Council's actions in humanitarian crises. I would like to thank Jean-Marie Guéhenno for the insight he provided us at the beginning of the meeting.

First, I would like to provide some historical background. What seems legitimate today has not always seemed so. The principle of Security Council intervention in humanitarian crises is a recent one, taking us back to the implementation of resolution 688 (1991) of 5 April 1991, by which the Council addressed the tragedy then under way in Iraqi Kurdistan. But we have come a long way since then.

Today, the Council can no longer stand aside from humanitarian tragedies affecting entire populations, who are direct or indirect victims of deadly conflicts. I shall not list the many such Security Council interventions in recent years. In our view, this development represents progress not only for the Council but for the entire Organization.

The means for intervention too have become more diverse. To be sure, much remains to be done to further enhance international community action. The avenues identified by the Greek presidency for preventing humanitarian tragedy and the recurrence of conflict, as set out in the draft presidential statement that we shall adopt at the end of today's meeting, appear to us to be the right ones.

Let me touch briefly on the question of Security Council action at the very time that a crisis erupts. Further debate has been sparked on the political need to intervene in humanitarian crises and in the conflicts to which they give rise, and a consensus is now emerging on the concept of a "responsibility to protect". That principle, which has arisen in the context of the General Assembly's preparations for the September summit, is in no way synonymous with interference. It reaffirms the primary responsibility of States and Governments to protect civilian populations in their territories. But when the State in question fails to meet its responsibility in the face of a very serious situation resulting from crimes against humanity, serious human rights violations or ethnic cleansing, the international community is duty-bound to act. That is not so different from the current practice of the Security Council. France earnestly hopes that will be possible to reach agreement on this principle at September's summit of heads of State or Government.

That said, we should bear in mind that each crisis situation is, by definition, unique: different from the others. The correct response to the Darfur tragedy is not the same as the one needed in any other grave humanitarian crisis situation.

The range of action available to the international community in humanitarian tragedies is broad. The choice depends on the circumstances: as I noted, humanitarian crises are dissimilar. Very specific problems arise. I am thinking in particular about ensuring that peacekeeping operations have secure access to vulnerable populations. The Council should constantly adapt its response to the problem before it. To do this, the Security Council's practice is to diversify its sources of information; we see that as a good thing. To mention only a few very recent examples, last month the Council welcomed to the Chamber Mr. Jan Egeland, the Emergency Relief Coordinator, for his six-monthly briefing on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (see S/PV.5209) and Mr. James Morris, Executive Director of the World Food Programme (see S/PV.5220). Their briefings provided valuable insights that supplemented those provided through statements by Special Representatives of the Secretary-General. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights is another valuable source of information for the Council.

I will conclude with a general comment on the responsibility borne by the entire international community. The Security Council is indeed at the centre of the action in crisis situations. Yet the Council is far from the only United Nations actor that must respond to humanitarian crises. The agencies of the United Nations system, States, non-governmental organizations and society civil all have a central role to play.

Mr. Fendrick (United States of America): Given the lateness of the hour, I apologize to colleagues for imposing upon them, and I will be very brief.

The United States regrets the unfortunate and inaccurate comments of the representative of Venezuela that mischaracterized the role of the United States Government and its efforts to support global peace and security. We believe they have only detracted from this important debate.

The President: After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council.

"The Security Council reaffirms the purposes and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and bears in mind its primary responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"The Security Council remains deeply concerned by the devastating humanitarian, political and economic consequences of armed conflicts, and stresses the overriding political and moral imperatives to prevent the outbreak and escalation of armed conflicts and humanitarian crises, and the benefits therein for peace and development and friendly relations among all States.

"The Security Council acknowledges the importance of helping to prevent future conflicts through addressing their root causes in a legitimate and fair manner.

"The Security Council reiterates the importance it attaches to the promotion and urgent restoration of justice and the rule of law in post-conflict societies and in promoting national reconciliation, democratic development and human rights. The Council recognizes that ending impunity is important in peace agreements and can contribute to efforts to come to terms with past abuses and to achieve national reconciliation to prevent future conflict. The Security Council recalls that it has repeatedly emphasized the responsibility of States to end impunity and bring to justice those responsible for genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and serious violations of international humanitarian law.

"The Security Council further recognizes the increasing importance of civilian aspects of conflict management in addressing complex crisis situations and in preventing the recurrence of conflict and acknowledges the importance of civilian-military cooperation in crisis management. When approving a United Nations operation, the Council should take into account the essential role of military and civilian police in assisting the stabilization of crisis situations and the maintenance of security. At the same time, the Council acknowledges that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, assisted by civilian advisers, could play a key coordination role in the provision of humanitarian assistance, the re-establishment of public order, the functioning of public institutions, as well as rehabilitation, reconstruction and peacebuilding, which lead to long-term sustainable development.

"The Security Council stresses the need to ensure adequate and timely financing for peacebuilding priorities at all stages of the peace process, and stresses the need for sustained financial investment in peacebuilding over the medium to longer-term period of recovery. It recognizes the importance of rapid initiation of peacebuilding activities to meet immediate needs and encourages the building of capabilities that can be incorporated rapidly.

"The Security Council takes note with interest of the important proposal by the Secretary-General to establish a Peacebuilding Commission and shares the objective of improving United Nations capacity to coordinate with donors and troop contributors and to perform peacebuilding activities, in particular from the start of peacekeeping operations through stabilization, reconstruction and development. The Security Council recognizes the important role that this body could play to bridge the gap between maintenance of international peace and security and the work of humanitarian and economic development assistance.

"The Security Council acknowledges that in post-conflict societies successful peacebuilding rests on the premise that protection of civilians, the promotion of the rule of law and transitional justice, disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, reintegration and rehabilitation of

former combatants, security sector and democratic, economic and social reform are integrated elements and that national ownership plays an important role which should be supported by the international community, including the regional organizations.

"The Security Council emphasizes that security sector reform is an essential element of any stabilization process in post-conflict environments, underlines that it is inextricably linked with promotion of the rule of law, transitional justice, DDR and the protection of civilians, among others, and acknowledges the need for more adequate preparation, including mobilization of necessary planning resources, and more coherent approaches by the United Nations and the international community in addressing these issues.

"The Security Council acknowledges the need to give adequate attention to security sector reform in the future, drawing on best practices that have been developed in this area. The Security Council stresses also the need seriously to consider the promotion of the rule of law and transitional justice, the DDR process and security sector reform, their interlinkage and the availability of adequate resources, when approving the necessary mandates for United Nations operations."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2005/30.

There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.